

ResearchOnline@ND

The University of Notre Dame Australia
ResearchOnline@ND

Theses

2015

A critique of the English translations of the Roman Canon with a comparative study of their implications

Giorgio Nulley
University of Notre Dame Australia

Follow this and additional works at: <http://researchonline.nd.edu.au/theses>



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#), and the [Religion Commons](#)

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA
Copyright Regulations 1969

WARNING

The material in this communication may be subject to copyright under the Act. Any further copying or communication of this material by you may be the subject of copyright protection under the Act.

Do not remove this notice.

Publication Details

Nulley, G. (2015). A critique of the English translations of the Roman Canon with a comparative study of their implications (Master of Philosophy (School of Philosophy and Theology)). University of Notre Dame Australia. <http://researchonline.nd.edu.au/theses/117>

This dissertation/thesis is brought to you by ResearchOnline@ND. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses by an authorized administrator of ResearchOnline@ND. For more information, please contact researchonline@nd.edu.au.



A Critique of the English Translations of the Roman Canon with a Comparative Study of their Implications

**By
Giorgio Nulley**

2015

Words: 54,500

This thesis has been submitted to Notre Dame University in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy in the School of Philosophy and Theology.

This thesis contains no material that has been accepted for the award of any other degree in any University. To the best of my knowledge and belief, this thesis contains no material previously published or written by any other person, except where due reference is given in footnotes.

Signed: _____

Date: ____/____/____

Acknowledgements

Researching and writing a thesis involves more than its author and I would like to acknowledge a number of people who have supported and encouraged me in this endeavour. Primarily I would like to thank my supervisor, Sr. Moira Debono RSM STD, who supported me throughout the process and allowed me the latitude to explore the subject widely. I am grateful for her advice, suggestions and support throughout the course of the research and writing of this thesis. I would like to thank the staff at the University of Notre Dame, the School of Philosophy and Theology, for their patience with me and for their assistance at those times when I needed guidance and support. To Mr Thomas Flynn, the university appointed Latin specialist who supported me and helped me to translate accurately and explained the technicalities of the Latin language and its impact on the English translation, I wish to express my deepest appreciation. I also wish to note the support of Ms Marilyn Veech, librarian, for her assistance in my research; and for the staff and executive at St Mary MacKillop College for their encouragement in practical ways throughout the course of the Master's programme. Furthermore, without the help of Rev. Fr. Brian O'Conner, Chancellor of the Diocese of Sale, in gaining access to the Roman Missals from which I obtained the texts of the Roman Canons noted in the Appendix of this thesis and for his support, then this thesis would be that much poorer. In addition, I would like to acknowledge and thank the technical assistance of my son, Thomas Nulley-Valdes, in the formatting process of the thesis. Finally, but by no means the least, I would like to thank my wife for her support and patience over the years when I was researching and writing the thesis. To her, especially, I shall be eternally grateful.

Abstract

The thesis examines the English translation of the Roman Canon from the relevant Latin Typical Edition texts initially revised by decree of the Second Vatican Council and published by authority of Pope Paul VI and subsequently revised at the direction of Pope John Paul II as the Third Typical Edition. This examination will critique language, grammar, punctuation and syntax of the two translations to the Latin text of the Roman Canon. Included in the examination will be a discussion and analysis of the role of punctuation in the theological understanding of the content of the prayers of the Roman Canon. It will be shown that punctuation influences the meaning conveyed in a prayer. Secondly, the way that language and grammar are used has a significant influence on the theological interpretation and understanding of God and of the relationship of God and mankind in the translation of this Prayer. The words and phrases chosen to translate the idea as well as the subtle nuances of that word translated from Latin must also be incorporated in the translation. If one is going to be faithful to the idea of *lex orandi, lex credendi* (the law of prayer is the law of belief) then one has to be accurate in the way the prayers are translated from Latin into English because the meaning conveyed in the translation has implications on what one believes when one prays. The precise meaning of this term is taken from Prosper of Aquitaine (5th Century) – *legem credenda lex statuat supplicandi* (meaning “the law of supplicating [praying] establishes/fixes/set forth the law of believing”)¹, which, in other words means prayers express belief. So, what I shall be arguing is that since ‘the law of prayer is the law of faith: the Church believes as she prays’² then the translations will have an impact on the expression of that faith. Finally, the thesis will demonstrate how the translation of the First Eucharistic Prayer may influence one’s understanding of the relationship of mankind and God. The focus of the thesis, then, is on the theological implications of the shifts that have occurred in the translations of the Latin text in the two versions of the Roman Canon as promulgated in 1969 and 2010 with the translation offered in 2010 being closer in content and theology to the Latin text that has remained constant throughout the revision.

¹ *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2nd Edition, St. Pauls, 1997, CCC 1124 (Hereafter CCC).

² *ibid.*

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	II
ABSTRACT	II
TABLE OF CONTENTS	V
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND TO THE INTRODUCTION OF THE VERNACULAR IN THE ROMAN CANON	1
CRITICISM OF THE “NEW TRANSLATION”	4
LITURGY IN THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH	7
PURPOSE FOR THE RESTORATION OF THE LITURGY	10
TOPIC AND PURPOSE	14
CONCLUDING REMARKS	17
CHAPTER 2	19
THE INFLUENCE OF LANGUAGE, PUNCTUATION AND GRAMMAR IN THE ROMAN CANON	19
INTRODUCTION	19
A CRITIQUE OF THE TRANSLATIONS OF THE ROMAN CANON OF 1974 AND OF 2010	20
THE ROMAN CANON – THE <i>HANC IGITUR</i> PRAYER	37
THE ROMAN CANON – THE <i>EPICLESIS</i>	39
THE ROMAN CANON – THE <i>INSTITUTION NARRATIVE</i>	42
THE ROMAN CANON – THE <i>ANAMNESIS</i> AND <i>OFFERING</i>	52
THE ROMAN CANON – <i>INTERCESSIONS</i>	59
THE ROMAN CANON – THE <i>FINAL DOXOLOGY</i>	63
CHAPTER 3	67
AN UNDERSTANDING OF GOD AS CONVEYED IN THE ROMAN CANON	67
INTRODUCTION	67
PREFACES OF ADVENT	69
PREFACES IN ORDINARY TIME	72
PREFACES OF LENT	76
PREFACES OF CHRISTMASTIDE AND THEIR ASSOCIATED <i>COMMUNICANTES</i> PRAYERS	81
PREFACES OF EASTERTIDE AND THEIR ASSOCIATED <i>COMMUNICANTES</i> PRAYERS	88
CONCLUDING REMARKS	98
CHAPTER 4	100
MANKIND AND THE ROLE OF GRACE AND THE THEOLOGY OF MERIT IN THE PRAYER OF THE ROMAN CANON	100
INTRODUCTION	100
OVERVIEW OF GRACE	101
TIMELESSNESS IN THE ROMAN CANON	105
PARTICIPATION OF THE LAITY	107
PARTICIPATION: <i>ARS CELEBRANDI</i>	112
THE MAGISTERIUM AND <i>ARS CELEBRANDI</i>	114
CONCLUDING REMARKS	126

CHAPTER 5	129
CONCLUSION	129
TRANSFORMED IN CHRIST	129
APPENDICES	137
APPENDIX A - MISSALE ROMANUM 1952	139
APPENDIX B - MISSALE ROMANUM 1962	150
APPENDIX C - THE ALTAR MISSAL 1964	164
APPENDIX D - THE ROMAN MISSALE 1974	174
APPENDIX E - MISSALE ROMANUM 2002	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
APPENDIX F - STRUCTURE OF THE ROMAN CANON	206
APPENDIX G - PREFACES	207
BIBLIOGRAPHY	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Background to the Introduction of the Vernacular in the Roman Canon

The revision of the Roman Missal, and in particular for the purpose of this thesis, the translation of the Roman Canon into the English language, did not occur in a vacuum but were the culmination of a relatively long line of liturgical reform.

Indeed, the question whether to use vernacular languages in the liturgy dates, in the modern period, from the Council of Trent (1545-1552), which forbade its use in the face of Protestant reforms meant to deny Catholic teaching (Council of Trent, Session 22, [September 17, 1562], especially chapters 8-9, *Canones de Sanctissimo missae Sacrificio*, no. 9). However, by the start of the liturgical movement in the twentieth century... new momentum built to suggest that pastorally and liturgically the Church was now ready at least to experiment with the vernacular.¹

It could be construed from this that even at that time there was a conviction that this reform had merit. In the context of liturgy, “Reform”², here, is understood to mean the changes and developments that have occurred over time with, for the purpose of this thesis, the major change being the reform permitting the recitation of the Roman Canon aloud and, secondly, in the vernacular. The decision to reform the liturgy and agree with ‘the limits of (the) employment (of the vernacular) may be extended’³ in the Mass was decided by Pope Paul VI at the Second Vatican Council with the Constitution on the Liturgy.

During the time frame in changing the texts from Latin into the vernacular, a greater emphasis was being placed on the word of God in the liturgy of the Mass, as well as the vast richness of the Liturgy of the Eucharist became available to the laity through direct access in the vernacular. Whereas in the reforms of the Council of

¹ Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *Liturgiam Authenticam* Fifth Instruction on Vernacular Translation of the Roman Liturgy, Latin-English Edition, Introduction, p 5 (Hereafter, LA)

² Throughout the thesis I have used the Oxford style of quoting in that I have used single quotation marks to denote a direct quote and I have used double quotation marks within a quote. This is similar to the Chicago style when writing papers in the field of theology – see Kate L. Turabian *A Manual for Writers* 21.10. In addition, where I am identifying a word or phrase of note for comment then I have used double quotation marks. Finally, when I have referred to Latin text, I have used italics.

³ Second Vatican Council. Constitution on the Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (4 December 1963) § 36 (2) (Hereafter SC)

Trent, the Mass, including the proclamation of the word of God as well as the Eucharistic Prayer being delivered in Latin, the fathers of the Second Vatican Council agreed that something was lost if the faithful did not know Latin. So, the use of the vernacular was seen as a positive step towards fuller lay participation at Mass. However, in the process of reforming the liturgy, a major tension emerged: to what extent was Latin to be retained in the liturgy and how much of the liturgy should be said in the vernacular. After all it was clear from the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy in paragraph 36 that the Council fathers anticipated that the impact of the vernacular would be minimal:

Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites.

But since the use of the mother tongue, whether in the Mass...frequently may be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended.⁴

Furthermore, Article 54 of this Constitution gave an indication as to the extent to which the mother tongue might be employed at Mass:

In Masses which are celebrated with the people, a suitable place may be allotted to their mother tongue. This is to apply in the first place to the readings and “the common prayer”, but also, as local conditions may warrant, to those parts which pertain to the people, according to the norm laid down in Article 36 of this Constitution. Nevertheless steps should be taken so that the faithful may also be able to say or to sing together in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them.⁵

In regards to this, the extent to which the vernacular could be introduced into the Mass was the subject of an extensive debate between the years 1964 and 1967. Perhaps because of the ambiguity of the interpretation of the application of these two articles as well as a push for greater participation of the laity in praying the Mass, ultimately a tension occurred centring around the Preface of the Mass being proclaimed in the vernacular and the Eucharistic Prayer continuing in Latin.⁶ Once it was clearly established that the Preface formed part of the Eucharistic Prayer, special leave was sought from the Holy See to allow the Canon of the Mass to be recited in the vernacular. Initially, the

⁴ SC §36 [1&2]

⁵ SC §54

⁶ Annibale Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975*, (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990) p. 104

main reason for the refusal of the Holy See to issue an approval was omissions found in the new versions (of the translations from the Typical Edition). The Holy See was insisting on ‘a “faithful and complete” translation.’⁷

In the interim following the leave granted by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith to allow as a temporary measure the use of existing translations found in the missalettes, the Consilium on August 10, 1967 sent with the approval of the Pope the authorisation.⁸ Throughout, the Holy See was guiding the Church ‘to render faithfully the text of the Roman Canon, without variations, omissions, or insertions which would make it different from the Latin text’.⁹ Bugnini (who was Secretary to the Commission for Liturgical Reform and who oversaw the passage of the Second Vatican Council’s Constitution on the Liturgy¹⁰) noted that eventually an agreement was reached on a French version of the translation, which was to be used as a model for other translations.¹¹

The current translation of the Roman Missal from Latin into English was a step in the process that began soon after the Latin edition of the Roman Missal of Pope Paul VI was approved and questions of the accuracy and appropriateness of the translation into English were raised. According to Fr. Stravinskis, ‘when the English *Missale Romanum* appeared in 1970, it was clear we had been handed a paraphrase instead of a translation’.¹² Indeed, *Liturgiam Authenticam* quoting Pope John Paul II, stated

ever since the promulgation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, the work of the translation of the liturgical texts into vernacular languages, as promoted by the Apostolic See, has involved the publication of norms and the communication to the Bishops of advice on the matter. Nevertheless, it has been noted that translations of liturgical texts in various localities stand in need of improvement through correction or through a new draft.¹³

⁷ Ibid., p. 109

⁸ Ibid. p. 108 : The authorisation from Consilium of 10 August 1967 noted that ‘since it is expected that a considerable period will be needed for the revision and confirmation of the versions prepared by the episcopal conferences, and since, while there is no official translation, provision should be made to supply the necessary uniformity between the various texts, the episcopal conferences may, *in the meantime*, approve and permit one of the translations already in use with permission of ecclesiastical authority’, p. 108

⁹ Ibid. Bugnini quoting the Consilium’s communique to the presidents of episcopal conferences and reiterated in an August 10, 1967 Communique.

¹⁰ Ibid. p. xxiii.

¹¹ Ibid. p. 109

¹² Peter M.J. Stravinskis, ‘Defending the New Roman Missal: A Response to Father Michael Ryan’, *Antiphon* 14 Issue 1 (2010), p. 142

¹³ Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, Fifth Instruction *Liturgiam Authenticam*: On Vernacular translation of the Roman Liturgy – Latin-English Edition – § 6, (Hereafter LA)

Criticism of the “New Translation”

Since the introduction of the “new translation” in 2010, then, there has been some debate not only of the necessity for the “new translation” but also of the translation itself. However, after an extensive research of academic journals, I have not found any criticism of the current translation on theological or academic grounds. However, there have been some critiques and comments of the translation in periodicals such as *The Priest*¹⁴ and *The Swag*¹⁵, and on a secular television programme, *Compass* in Australia. In the latter, criticism was mainly centred around the need for a change in the translation of prayers of the Roman Canon as promulgated by Pope Paul VI and what has been currently offered as the authentic translation, as well as on the linguistics of some of the changes. However, anecdotal critiques of the current translation do exist: the one from Bishop Peter Elliott affirms the current changes arguing from a linguistic approach that previous ‘paraphrasing is not good enough for sacred texts composed in Latin and Greek over many centuries of use in Divine Liturgy (indeed)... a paraphrase can fail to give us, not only what the Latin original means, which is bordering on telling lies, but a paraphrase often eliminates poetic beauty in the original, particularly scriptural language that runs through the prayers of the Roman Rite Mass’.¹⁶ Whereas Derick Furness in a feature article in *The Swag*, criticised the literal translation of the Latin in the current translation and drew uninformed conclusions about the use of “for many”, not the least being that it is Scriptural, at the consecration of the Precious Blood:

In Latin “Multos” may mean a multitude without specification as to whether it is some or all. But in English “many” means a sizable number, but not all. It is the teaching of the Church that Jesus died for all. I have no intention of proclaiming a heresy at the heart of the Eucharist.¹⁷

Otherwise, other criticisms, as telecast on the Australian Broadcasting Corporation’s *Compass* programme, were of the translation and the way that the Missal was introduced into circulation and use.¹⁸ On a more serious note, Fr. Peter

¹⁴ Bishop Peter J. Elliott, ‘Hear the difference: the new Missal translation will be like rediscovering buried treasure’, *The Priest*, p. 4

¹⁵ Derick Furness, ‘The new translation’, *The Swag* Autumn 2013, p. 26

¹⁶ Op. cit., Bishop Peter J. Elliott, p. 4

¹⁷ Derick Furness, ‘The new translation’, *The Swag*, p. 26

¹⁸ Geraldene Doogue, ABC presenter on *Compass*, quote from, ‘Catholics Divided’, *Compass*, date of broadcast: 01/04/2012

Stravinskis in a rebuttal to Fr. Michael Ryan quotes him saying the ‘Roman Curia and other parties are involved in a “systematic dismantling of the great vision of the Council’s decree” and that the Congregation for Divine Worship is raising “rubricism to an art form”, with liturgy being used “as a weapon – to advance specific agendas”’.¹⁹ He, Stravinskis, defends the translation as a means of ‘seeking to reclaim “the great vision of the council’s” constitution’.²⁰ My thesis will argue that the current translation is not only true to the original Latin of the *Missale Romanum*, it is also consistent with the idea: *lex orandi, lex credendi* (the law of prayer is the law of belief). This paraphrase is taken from Prosper of Aquitaine (5th Century) writings – *legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi* (meaning ‘the law of supplicating [praying] establishes/fixes/set forth the law of believing’)²¹, which, in other words may mean prayers express belief. The implication of this is that the this proverb

Prosper’s maxim that the Church’s prayer grounds the Church’s belief is the first succinct articulation of what had, in fact, already been an accepted premise of theological argument...The way the Church enacted the liturgy clearly influenced how the Church articulated and described its belief.²²

So, what I shall be arguing is that since ‘the law of prayer is the law of faith: the Church believes as she prays’²³ then the translations will have an impact on the expression of that faith. The Consilium (situated in the Vatican) that had the responsibility for implementing the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, published its guidelines, *Comme et Prévoit*, which later became recognised to be deficient as a guide for translation. In particular there were two issues in question ‘inculturation ... and (2) fidelity not only between the original Latin text and the vernacular as expressions of the same content of faith, but also fidelity with the spirit and style of the Roman rite’.²⁴ In fact, the Most Reverend Oscar H. Lipscomb, Chairman of the (US) Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy, in the introduction to *Liturgiam Authenticam* Fifth Instruction on Vernacular Translation of the Roman Liturgy (US

¹⁹ Peter M.J. Stravinskis, ‘Defending the New Roman Missal: A Response to Father Michael Ryan’, *Antiphon* 14 Issue 1 (2010), p. 143 (Unfortunately, Stravinskis did not cite the article to which he was responding)

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ CCC 1124

²² Fr. Kevin W. Irwin, ‘Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi – Origins and Meaning: State of the Question’, *Liturgical Ministry* 11 (Spring 2002), p. 58

²³ Op. cit., CCC 1124

²⁴ LA, Introduction, pg. 7

edition) stated that this Instruction was to address these two issues.²⁵ In relation to the second point, it would appear that the choices of words and consistency to the Roman rite in the translation process are important in order to maintain in the English translation ‘the same content of faith’ found in Latin.

In other words, what a person would hear were he/she to listen to the text of the Eucharistic Prayer in 1952 or 1962, 1964, 1974 or 2010 in Latin (see appendices A, B, C, D and E), he/she would hear similar words and phrases of the prayer in each case. A word of explanation is required here in that the reference to Saint Joseph was introduced into the Roman Canon in 1962 by Pope John XXIII, which was a significant pre-Vatican II development. As well as this, a few minor changes to the ending of prayers within the Roman Canon were introduced as a result of the changes that were initiated by Vatican II. Two other changes that came about through the decision of the Second Vatican Council were that the Roman Canon could be recited aloud for the benefit of the congregation and that, eventually, the whole Mass could be celebrated in the vernacular.

However, in relation to the changes to the Latin text, these include changes to the endings of three prayers within the Roman Canon: in the *Communicantes*; *Supplices te rogamus*; and *Memento etiam, Domine* prayers the word *eundem* /“same” in the ending: *Per [eundem] Christum, Dominum nostrum* has been deleted. Secondly, in the prayer, *Quam oblationem* prayer the phrase: *Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen*, which had previously been part of the text was deleted in 1967 and left out in the 2010 text. Thirdly, at the words of consecration over the bread the words: *QUOD PRO VOBIS TRAHETUR* were added in the 1974 text and retained in subsequent texts. In addition, at the words of consecration over the wine, the words: *Haec quotiescumque feceritis, in mei memoriam facietis* were replaced with *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem* added in the 1974 text and also retained in subsequent texts. Finally, the proclamation: *Mysterium fidei* was added with their acclamations added in 1974. Indeed, the changes to those prayers pale into insignificance when compared to the attempts at the initial official translation of the Latin text into English (see Appendices A, B, C, D & E). However, what has changed in the intervening years (between 1969 and 2010) is that attempts at the translation of

²⁵ *ibid.*

the Latin into English have been open to question in reference to the accuracy of translation, which has had an impact on what it is that the Church is praying.

Liturgy in the Life of the Church

So, it becomes necessary to discuss liturgy. In the Christian tradition liturgy ‘means the participation of the People of God in “the work of God (liturgy)” and through liturgy Christ, our redeemer and high priest, continues the work of our redemption in, with, and through his Church’.²⁶ This is effected by proclaiming and celebrating the glory of God through liturgy and through it the faithful may be sanctified so that from it, (liturgy) they may have life and thereby bear witness to the world of the love of God. Indeed, ‘it is in the liturgy, especially in the divine sacrifice of the Eucharist, that “the work of our redemption is accomplished”, and it is through the liturgy especially that the faithful are enabled to express in their lives and manifest to others the mystery of Christ and the real nature of the true Church’.²⁷ In the words of Saint Paul, the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ (see 1 Cor 12:12-31; Col 1:18; 2:18-20; Eph 1:22-23; 3:19; 4:13), a theme that was taken up by Pope Pius XII in his encyclical, *Mystici Corporis Christi* (1943) where Christ is the Head and all those who are baptised and profess their faith in Him, and, as well, submit to the authority of the pope and the bishops that are in communion with him are incorporated into this Body. And when Jesus commanded that “do this in memory of me” at the Last Supper he gave all the opportunity to be united with him in his worship of the Father: ‘The work of salvation, begun by Christ, and commissioned to the Apostles, continues in the Church today and throughout history’.²⁸ The Mass especially, and indeed all the sacraments celebrate the Paschal Mystery where God’s action of redemption and salvation of mankind is proclaimed. So, the fundamental pattern of liturgy is the ‘movement from God to man and back to God’.²⁹ Indeed, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy continues with, ‘To accomplish so great a work (that is, the work of salvation), Christ is always present in his Church, especially in her liturgical celebrations...(and) from this it follows that every liturgical celebration,

²⁶ CCC 1069

²⁷ SC §2

²⁸ SC §6

²⁹ Liam G Walsh OP, ‘Liturgy in the Theology of St. Thomas’, *The Thomist* Vol. 38, № 3 (1974) p. 561

because it is an action of Christ, is a sacred action surpassing all others'.³⁰ It is Christ who is both priest and victim in his everlasting offering of himself to his Father.

Hence, since God is the focus of liturgy the next step is to discern what constitutes liturgy. 'Liturgy is a pattern of signs and symbols that speak to our senses of the spiritual realities they seek to represent'³¹ and are the fruits of the Paschal Mystery given to us in the Sacraments. Indeed, the Mass is the representation of the Paschal Mystery. And, this sacred mystery could not be salvific without the Incarnation – the great sign where the Word became flesh – and 'in the Church of the Word incarnate this unique sign is itself represented by the ritual signs we call the sacraments'.³² Meanwhile, as Walsh posits, the 'signs being talked about are instituted by God'.³³ And as Nichols argues quoting St. Thomas Aquinas, he 'gives a rationale for God's institution, according to the biblical narrative, of *sensibilia sacrificia* "sacrifices in sensible form"'.³⁴ This gives credence to, and supports the point that liturgy is a pattern of signs and symbols that speak to our senses of the spiritual realities they seek to represent.

Indeed, ever since the "Fall" God has lovingly intervened in the history of mankind and initiated and/or acknowledged what was required of man in the worship of God. Beginning with the sacrifice of Abel, continuing with that of Abraham, the offering made by Melchizedek, and the instructions given to Moses, God has prompted man to acknowledge his dependence on his creator Lord. In fact, not only must man acknowledge that he is created by God; he must also acknowledge that he is fallen. Consequently, any worship offered by man to God is flawed.

Therefore, God has placed "certain hallowings through things of the sense" in acts of washing or anointing, eating or drinking (which), as St. Thomas writes, "signifying to mankind that it receives gifts in the intelligible order from a source outside itself and (more especially) from God whose own Name, after all, is expressed by sensible words".³⁵ Ironically, redemption from the "Fall" was achieved by one man, Jesus, for 'as one man's trespass led to condemnation of all men, so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men' (Rm. 5:18). As much as he may have wanted to, of himself, man could not redeem himself. Man having been

³⁰ SC §7

³¹ Aidan Nichols OP, 'St. Thomas and the Sacramental Liturgy', *The Thomist* 72 (2008), p. 571

³² Ibid. 572

³³ Op. cit., Walsh, p. 570

³⁴ Op. cit., Nichols, p. 578

³⁵ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, III, c. 119

created by God – ‘God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them’ (Gn. 1:27) – strives to return to God. However, ‘sin impedes this return to which man nonetheless still aspires with a desire that is naturally ineradicable yet of itself ineffective’.³⁶ Nichols continues with an explanation of how this can be achieved effectively namely that it is through the mystery of the Incarnation: ‘when in the divine person of the Word human nature is assumed into union with the divine nature this is for all of us the way home to the Father’s house’.³⁷ Mankind is saved through the human nature of Christ and this is made possible through the hypostatic union of Christ’s divine and human natures. In the Incarnation, then, God became man and through the humanity of Christ redeemed mankind.

Redemption, which was completed once and for all on Calvary with Christ’s Passion, Death and subsequent Resurrection is the reality that is made present in the Mass through Christ in his priestly capacity. Unfortunately, ‘too many modern Catholics...think the Mass is something that the priest and the congregation do together when, in fact, it is something that Jesus does’.³⁸ Participation at Mass has often been construed to mean things that people do and who should be doing these activities. ‘To say the liturgy is a mystery is to say it is an act and presence of Christ’.³⁹ The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy supports this with: ‘Every liturgical celebration, because it is the action of Christ the priest and of His Body which is the Church, is a sacred action surpassing all others’.⁴⁰ The role of the priest at Mass is to stand ‘in persona Christi’ and to ‘serve as a mediator between God and human beings, conveying men’s prayer and penance to God and God’s gifts to men’.⁴¹ However, the priest can do this only through the priesthood of Christ. This he does through the reception of the Sacrament of Holy Orders where the priest receives a share in the priesthood of Christ. Lay participation in the priesthood of Christ is granted them by virtue of their Baptism and through this sacrament the faithful may offer the sacrifice of the Mass through the priest. Hence, ‘man performs certain sensible actions (rituals), not to arouse God but to arouse himself to things divine: such as prostrations,

³⁶ Op. cit., Nichols, pp. 582-583

³⁷ Ibid. p. 583

³⁸ Paul MacLeod, ‘The elephant in the sanctuary’, *AD2000* Vol. 26, № 5 (1June 2013) pg. 15

³⁹ Op. cit., Walsh, p. 570

⁴⁰ SC §7

⁴¹ Op. cit., Nichols, p. 585

genuflections, raising the voice and singing’.⁴² At Mass, the community gathered is in the presence of God and the signs, symbols, rituals and actions should reflect the sacred nature of the occasion. Indeed, it is ‘through the liturgy Christ, our redeemer and high priest, continues the work of our redemption in, with and through his Church’.⁴³

Consequently, ‘people have a right to a correct, reverent liturgy, whose purpose is plainly to offer worship to God and to sanctify His people – not to entertain them’.⁴⁴ Reform, in contrast to more radical change implies a certain appreciation of what one has in the liturgy as well as an acceptance that some change is welcome. Therefore, argues MacLeod, that where there is liturgical abuse (that is, a corrupt practice either in the form of rituals or in the form of the words used in the liturgical prayers), there are two guilty parties – the ‘priests who are blatant in their disobedience, and those in authority who fail to take action on behalf of their people’.⁴⁵ In regard to the former, it would appear that the issue of change becomes a matter of semantics for where the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy speaks of “participation” and “reform” and “restoration”, some have interpreted this to mean “innovation” even when this Constitution specifically warns against it⁴⁶ – arguing that the Mass, after all, is “our celebration”. Indeed, this document begins with the aspiration to reform and promote the liturgy.⁴⁷ As such, when the Church speaks of reform, there is an implication that there is something worthwhile maintaining and that there are others that might need change. In outlining the desire for reform, paragraph 21 of the Constitution elaborates on this with the intention to undertake ‘with great care a general restoration of the liturgy itself’ and defining what may or may not be reviewed: ‘For the liturgy is made up of immutable elements divinely instituted and of elements subject to change’.⁴⁸

Purpose for the Restoration of the Liturgy

The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy then set forth why the restoration should take place: ‘In this restoration, both texts and rites should be drawn up so that

⁴² Op. cit., Walsh, p. 573

⁴³ CCC 1069

⁴⁴ Op. cit., MacLeod. p. 15

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ SC §22 [3]

⁴⁷ SC §1

⁴⁸ SC §21

they express more clearly the holy things which they signify; the Christian people, so far as possible, should be enabled to understand them with ease and to take part in them fully, actively, and as befits a community'.⁴⁹ So, the purpose of the changes signalled were to enable the faithful to participate more fully at Mass so that they might obtain all the spiritual benefits available through the grace of God. The review of the texts and rites were to be undertaken by a committee of experts with the provision that bishops were to be consulted⁵⁰ and that the review would be under the supervision of the Holy See.⁵¹ The Constitution also stipulated that 'sound tradition may be retained, and yet the way remain open for legitimate progress'.⁵² This would suggest that the changes were to be supported by traditional practices and prayers of the Church with the possibility for limited change. Finally, in paragraph 36 of the Constitution, 'the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites ... but since the use of the mother tongue, whether in the Mass...or other parts of the liturgy, frequently may be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended'.⁵³ Furthermore, paragraph 54 develops this idea stipulating that where the 'mother tongue' might be used the faithful were to be encouraged to respond 'in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them'.⁵⁴ So, any changes had to be supported by the tradition of the Church, they were to express more clearly the holy things which they signify, and that Latin was to be preserved with provision being made for the use of the vernacular.

This is what the Church taught in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy and the guidelines that it established for the reform of the Mass. Now Article 34, which established the norms for the revision, is an important teaching: 'The rites should be distinguished by a noble simplicity; they should be short, clear, and unencumbered by useless repetitions; they should be within the people's powers of comprehension, and normally should not require much explanation'.⁵⁵ These designations are open to interpretation – and some of these are more sensitive than others: for example, what do "noble simplicity" and "unencumbered by useless repetitions" mean; and furthermore, by whom and how is "useless" to be defined? Paragraph 50 gives an

⁴⁹ SC §21

⁵⁰ SC §25

⁵¹ SC §22 [1]

⁵² SC §23

⁵³ SC §36

⁵⁴ SC §54

⁵⁵ SC §34

indication as to how “noble simplicity” might be understood: in the process of the simplification of the rites, ‘due care (is to be) taken to preserve their substance; elements which, with the passage of time, came to be duplicated, or were added with but little advantage, are now to be discarded’.⁵⁶ Unfortunately, though, as far as the translation of the Roman Missal is concerned, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy was vague about the norms guiding the translation of Latin into the vernacular. This was probably because paragraphs 36 and 50 gave the impression that not much of the Ordinary of the Mass was to be translated; and that the Readings for the Mass would be subject to translations of the Scriptures from the Bible.

Given that the Church had never translated its liturgical texts into the vernacular before, there was no design for doing this. So, in 1969 the Consilium for implementing the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* published its guidelines for the process of translating Latin liturgical texts into English and the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) took responsibility for overseeing this translation process. According to the guidelines by the Consilium, in *Comme et Prévoit* three important points were to be considered: ‘Translations ... must be faithful to the art of communication in all its various aspects, but especially in regard to the message itself, in regard to the audience for which it is intended, and in regard to the manner of expression’.⁵⁷ In this respect it is important to note that translators were guided by the expectation that ‘in rendering any liturgical text, the translator must keep in mind the major importance of the spoken or rhetorical style or what might, by extension of the term, be called its literary genre’.⁵⁸ In order to do this well, the document suggests ‘the essential elements (of the general structure of the Roman prayers), so far as possible, should be preserved in translation, sometimes intact, sometimes in equivalent terms’.⁵⁹ It would be fair to say that following the implementation of this instruction in the translation of the Roman Canon, that the application of these two corollaries of translation that the result fell short of the mark – especially in comparison to the translation of 2010. Indeed, Rev. Bruce E Harbert has noted that the Vatican ‘having warned against inappropriate translation, offered advice about what liturgical translation should be like’.⁶⁰ Unfortunately, current

⁵⁶ SC §50

⁵⁷ On the translation of Liturgical Texts for Celebrations with a Congregation *Comme et Prévoit*, § 7

⁵⁸ *ibid.*, § 25

⁵⁹ *ibid.*, § 28

⁶⁰ Bruce E Harbert, ‘The Roman Rite and the English Language’, *Antiphon* 9 Issue 1 (2005), p. 21

theories of translation of that time continued to influence the translation of the Roman Missal until, as Stephen Beall observed, that with the advent of the Fifth Instruction on Vernacular Translation: *Liturgiam Authenticam*,

the Latin texts set the standard not only for the theological content of vernacular translations, but also for their literary quality. This represents a significant departure from the previous instruction, issued in 1969 (*Comme le prévoit* §§ 8, 12, 15, 20 and 28). Liturgists in those days, following a new fashion in biblical translation, thought they could distinguish the universal message of the liturgical text from its linguistically variable form. Translators could be more or less indifferent to the style, syntax, and even vocabulary of the original, as long as they succeeded in conveying its essential ideas. *Liturgiam Authenticam*, on the other hand, takes the view that literary form and theological content are, for the most part, inextricably united.⁶¹

In his essay, Beall critiqued not only the shortcomings of paraphrasing translations from Latin into English; he also highlighted the inaccuracies conveyed by not adhering to the syntax of the original text. Hence, Beall emphasised the need for the close relationship between form and content when engaged in translating and, according to him, *Liturgiam Authenticam* has addressed this need. In fact, the principle that would guide translations would be that the, ‘original text, insofar as possible, must be translated integrally and in the most exact manner, without omissions or additions in terms of their content, and without paraphrases or glosses’.⁶² And, as Harbert noted, one of the major deficiencies of the previous translation of the Roman Missal, including the Roman Canon was that it employed the active voice of the verb extensively. This had the unfortunate consequence of appearing that the ‘emphasis (was) on what we do, not on anything that might happen to us’ and he interpreted this as being ‘linked to Pelagianism’.⁶³ This is a serious charge, which only makes the process of translating sacred texts all the more onerous and inclusive of all the stakeholders – as the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy and *Liturgiam Authenticam* have outlined. Therefore, Lauren Pristas noted that ‘the quality of translations, the linguistic theories undergirding them, the competence of a mixed

On The Translation of Liturgical Texts For Celebrations With A Congregation: *Comme le prévoit* says ‘it is not enough, when translating a text for liturgy, to express in another language the literal context and ideas of the original text. One must also make the effort to communicate faithfully to a given people in its own language what the Church wished to communicate by the original to another people in another language’.

⁶¹ Stephen Beall, ‘*Mirabilia Dei*: Style and Translation in the Prefaces of the *Missale Romanum*’, *Antiphon* 8 Issue 1 (2003), p. 10

⁶² LA §20

⁶³ Op. cit., Harbert, p. 22

commission to compose original texts, and the respective roles of the bishops conferences and the Holy See in approving vernacular translations are important for nothing is more formative and expressive of the Church's faith than the words with which she prays each day'.⁶⁴ And the current translation of the Roman Missal has fulfilled these expectations – *lex orandi, lex credendi* in that the Church's teaching about one's relationship with God is articulated and made manifest in the celebration of the liturgy through an honest and accurate translation of the Latin text of the Roman Canon. And it has done so because when prayers express beliefs – and certain interpretations had crept into the translation of 1974 that were not part of the formula of prayers in Latin, which affects what we believe – then the translation of 2010 not only restored that formulaic balance of the prayers (between the Latin and English) it also reiterated the faith implied in the Roman Canon in Latin.

Topic and Purpose

The approach to defending this thesis, then, is a comparative study of the current translation of the First Eucharistic Prayer with its predecessor. The issue has been the accuracy of the translation of the Roman Canon: 'when faced with texts...translators should avoid vernacularisation which explains rather than translates'.⁶⁵ The Instruction, *Ratio Translationis*, was delivered in 2007 by the Vatican as an instrument to assist the process of translating liturgical texts of the Roman rite into any given modern language as directed by *Liturgiam Authenticam*. According to *Ratio Translationis*, in the translation process the genre and syntax of the original Latin needs to be respected in translations.⁶⁶ Subsequently, there will be a discussion of man's relationship with God through the prayers of the Eucharistic Prayer and further, a discussion on grace and merit as revealed through the Roman Canon. The comparative study, initially, will include a discussion and analysis of the role of punctuation in the theological understanding of the content of the prayers of the First Eucharistic Prayer. The way that punctuation is employed has a bearing on the meaning conveyed in a prayer. Secondly, the way that language and grammar are used has a significant influence on the theological interpretation and understanding of

⁶⁴ Lauren Pristas, 'Theological Principles that guide the Redaction of the Roman Missal (1970)', *The Thomist* 67 (2003), pp. 157-158

⁶⁵ Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *Ratio Translationis* for the English Language, §12 (Hereafter RT)

⁶⁶ Ibid. See §§32, 54 and 55 where the use of the "extended subordination" in the Latin rite is discussed and §§ 102, 103 and 104 syntax is used to convey theological statements.

God and of the relationship of God and mankind in this Prayer. The words and phrases chosen to translate not only the idea behind the word expressed in the context of the Prayer, the subtle nuances of that word translated from Latin must also be incorporated in the translation. If one is going to be faithful to the idea of *lex orandi, lex credendi*, that is, that prayers express belief, then one has to choose wisely how one translates the prayers from Latin into English with reference to the *editio typica*. Thirdly, the thesis will demonstrate how the translation of the First Eucharistic Prayer may influence our understanding of the relationship of mankind and God.

Through liturgy, then, one becomes rightly ordered; meaning that by focussing on God one's priorities are reoriented away from a focus on self and towards God and of service to others through him: 'Liturgy unites the voice of the Church both in heaven and on earth'.⁶⁷ The structure of the Roman Canon gives one the opportunity in form, structure and prayers to achieve this end. The First Eucharistic Prayer is tiered towards the consecration of the bread and wine as its apex, which includes the Exclamation/Acclamation ("*Mysterium fidei...*") and the anamnesis ("*Unde et memores*"). On either side of this high point of the Eucharistic Prayer is the Epiclesis – before the consecration there is the First Formula of Offering in the form of the "*Hanc igitur*" followed by the First (Consecratory) Epiclesis in the form of the "*Quam oblationem*". On the other side of, and immediately following the consecration, there is the second formula of offering through the prayer, "*Supra quae*" and the second (communion) epiclesis in the prayer, "*Supplices te rogamus*".

On either side of these epicleses are the prayers of intercession – before the consecration are the prayers of intercession for the Church, the Pope, the Bishop, as well as for the living; and the first list of saints. After the consecration and following the second (communion) epiclesis, there are the second set of intercessions – for the deceased as well as for the participants – and the second list of saints. Expanding out from the consecration as the high point of the Eucharistic Prayer there is the 'transition and first prayer of acceptance' in the prayer, "*Te igitur*" and, after the consecration, after the second prayers of intercessions, there is the 'concluding blessing' in the prayer "*per quem haec omnia*". Then, beginning the Eucharistic Prayer with "*Dominus vobiscum*" there is the Preface which concludes with the

⁶⁷ RT §5

Sanctus; and the Eucharistic Prayer ends with a prayer of praise of the Final Doxology with “*per ipsum et cum ipso*” and followed by the great “Amen”.⁶⁸

The opportunity that liturgy presents, and for the purpose of this thesis the Eucharistic Prayer, is that it gives one an occasion for obtaining grace – that is, a sharing, and a participation in the life of God. The Eucharistic Prayer highlights the paschal mystery, which has two aspects: through it ‘by his death, Christ liberates us from sin; by his Resurrection, he opens for us the way to a new life. This new life is above all justification that reinstates us in God’s grace, “so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life” (Rom. 6:4; cf. 4:25)’.⁶⁹ As such the reform has given rise to liturgy being the work of

the whole Christ, the head and the members always united together, who offers God the perfect act of worship due to him: this is its ascending dimension. On the other hand, Christ continues, in and through the Church to exercise his priestly office in the liturgy and thus to sanctify men: this is the descending dimension of liturgy which was thus recovered⁷⁰

These movements are achieved through the use of elevated language, which lends support to the sacredness of the Eucharistic Prayer in its present form. Therefore, since the Mass is a celebration and commemoration of the Paschal Mystery, the ‘cross is, for Jesus, a sacrament of union with God. The Eucharist is, for us, the sacrament of a union which has not been fully accomplished’.⁷¹

To begin with, then, the whole Eucharistic Prayer is a prayer of thanksgiving and both translations of the Roman Canon (1974 and 2010) will be theologically examined for their insights of God, and man’s relationship to God. Beginning with the way that language, grammar and punctuation are used in the translations in Chapter 2, a selection of the Prefaces in Chapter 3, will be critiqued in terms of how they, as a whole summarise the history of salvation and God’s role in that history. Following this there will be an examination and critique of the Prefaces and the proper “*Communicantes*” for a selection of major feasts and solemnities such as: ‘On the Nativity of the Lord and throughout the Octave’, ‘From the Mass of the Paschal Vigil until the Second Sunday of Easter’, ‘On the Ascension of our Lord’, and ‘On

⁶⁸ Johannes H. Emminghaus, *The Eucharist* Essence, Form, Celebration, Chart II on pg. 206 (see diagram in Appendix F of this thesis)

⁶⁹ CCC 654

⁷⁰ Marc Aillet, *The Old Mass and the New* Explaining the Motu Proprio ‘*Summorum Pontificum*’, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010) p. 36

⁷¹ Tad W. Guzie SJ, *Jesus and the Eucharist*, p. 101

Pentecost Sunday’; and “*Hanc Igitur*” ‘From the Mass of the Paschal Vigil until the Second Sunday of Easter’. The choice of Prefaces was based upon their centrality to interpreting the paschal mystery and because they would be examined in the context of the special forms of the “*Communicantes*” recited in the Roman Canon.

Furthermore, in Chapter 4, the focus will be on God’s grace and the role of merit in the salvation of mankind as implied through the translations of the Roman Canon. Christ demonstrates for all what it means to be truly human in that, like Adam who ‘was not only created good, but was also established in friendship with his Creator and in harmony with himself and with the creation around him’.⁷² However, the difference between Adam and Christ is that Christ is both truly man as well as being the eternal Son of God. Indeed, as St Paul in his Epistle to the Philippians states, ‘and being found in human form, he humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death – even death on a cross’ (Phil 2: 8). Now obedience does not come easily and the Letter to the Hebrews explains that Christ ‘although he was a Son, he learned obedience through what he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became the source of all who obey him, having been designated by God a high priest according to the order of Melchizedek’ (Heb. 5: 8-10). This is so because the will of Christ perfectly aligned with the will of God. When sin entered the world through Adam and Eve, mankind diminished in the potential of what it was to be human as Adam and Eve experienced their relationship with God walking with Him in the Garden (see Gn. 3: 8). The diminishment of their status and consequence of sin was death, which led to a rupture in man’s relationship with God. So, ‘merit’ will be discussed in relationship with ‘grace’ as God’s mercy and generosity were demonstrated in accepting the offering of His eternal Son as sacrifice for sin while we were in a state of sin and separation from God.

Concluding Remarks

Since mankind is flawed through Original Sin and, consequently, struggles to align his will with the will of God, there is, in the Church’s understanding that all need salvation and that salvation is offered to all through Christ. The Roman Canon as the great Prayer of Thanksgiving in the Liturgy of the Eucharist during Mass becomes the expression that lifts one to the reality where Christ continues the work of

⁷² CCC 374

our redemption in the lives of people. The text speaks to the reality that we have sinned, that Christ redeems us through his Death and Resurrection, and which we commemorate in the Mass. Reform of the liturgy, then, has made possible a more active participation of the faithful through: singing the Sanctus (although it is acknowledged that this was sung by the choir as members of and on behalf of the congregation at High Mass previously); proclaiming the Acclamation after the consecration; and acclaiming the great “Amen” at the end of the Eucharistic Prayer and because the Eucharistic Prayer is in the vernacular, the faithful could more easily engage in the Prayer with the priest through silence because they can understand what was being said.

Finally, paragraph 11 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* introduces this emphasis on conscious, active, and fruitful participation with these words: ‘In order that the liturgy may be able to produce its full effects, it is necessary that the faithful come to it with proper dispositions, that their minds should be attuned to their voices, and that they should cooperate with divine grace lest they receive it in vain’.⁷³ Then, through conscious, active, participation liturgy becomes fruitful – that is, a moment of grace is experienced. Through an authentic translation of the Roman Canon from Latin into English then, participation in the liturgy may become a grace-filled experience for the faithful.

⁷³ SC §11

CHAPTER 2

The Influence of Language, Punctuation and Grammar in the Roman Canon

Introduction

Grammar, which is the structure of a language, and punctuation in the Roman Canon have the capacity to inform worshippers of the way they are to perceive, interpret and understand the language of the Eucharistic Prayer.¹ According to the *The New Shorter Oxford Dictionary*, grammar is ‘the branch of language study or linguistics which deals with the means of showing the relationship between words in use, traditionally divided into the study...of the structure of sentences (syntax) etcetera’. In other words, grammar, which demonstrates the relationship between the words used and the way that they are assembled in order to communicate meaning, will be used to test the way that the Latin text of the Roman Canon has been translated into English and how differences in the translation, according to the rules of English grammar may influence the meaning that the Latin text intended to convey. And language, in its turn, is important especially when it is the product of translation because it has the capacity to colour one’s appreciation and interpretation of what is conveyed in the original language of the prayer. In relation to the process of translation, the Constitution on the Liturgy allowed the use of the vernacular but that ‘the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites’² and in order that ‘sound tradition may be retained, and yet the way remain open to legitimate progress...there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing’.³ This chapter will examine two translations of the Roman Canon: the one approved in 1970 by Pope Paul VI,⁴ a Eucharistic Prayer that has been criticised for the

¹ John Eastwood, *Oxford Guide to English Grammar* (Melbourne: OUP, 1994) has been used throughout.

² Second Vatican Council. Constitution on the Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (4 December 1963) §36 (Hereafter SC)

³ Ibid. §23

⁴ This thesis uses the 1974 version of the Roman Canon (as cited in Appendix D – with its Latin version of the Eucharistic Prayer) as approved by the Australian Bishops Conference and available in electronic version through *LabOra*, the Liturgical Commission in Brisbane, Australia.

quality of its translation from Latin into English; and the second one, which is the final version of the Eucharistic Prayer approved by Pope Benedict XVI in the year 2010. Throughout the chapter, the use of punctuation and the way that language and grammar are used to express the prayer of the People of God will be compared and contrasted between the two translations of the Roman Canon.

A Critique of the Translations of the Roman Canon of 1974 and of 2010

The Eucharistic Prayer begins with the celebrant's salutation, '*Dominus vobiscum*' and continues with the response of the congregation, '*Et cum spiritu tuo*' which response in the 1974 version was translated as, 'And also with you'. In accordance with current trends in translation then, this was considered a reasonable summary of the intention of what the appropriate response to the salutation should be. In the current version, the response has been restored to 'And with your spirit'. Bernard Botte, has argued that the response 'And with your spirit'⁵ is an accurate translation of the Latin not only in meaning but also in the intention behind the words. He argues from both the philological and the Biblical perspectives. His philological argument is that when translating words and especially the ideas inherent in those words 'a philologist will not hesitate to search for an equivalent in the language of translation and to avoid idiocies that would render the translation incomprehensible'.⁶ Referring to different texts in the Bible, he argues that the word "spirit" is the appropriate term to use.

However, it is true that in certain cases, the word we translate by "soul" has the value of a pronoun. If, then, St Paul had said, "The grace of the Lord be with your soul", one could have a discussion. But he said, "with your spirit", and in no way is the word we translate as "spirit" (*ruah, ruhō*) used in a pronominal sense.⁷

Supporting his philological argument, Botte traces the Biblical origins of the response to the greeting of Saint Paul; in particular to four texts:

Gal 6:18 and Phil 4:23: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ (be) with your spirit, brethren. Amen."

2 Tm 4:22: "The Lord (be) with your spirit".

Phlm v. 25: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ (be) with your spirit."⁸

⁵ Bernard Botte, 'Dominus Vobiscum', excerpt translated by Peter Stravinskias, *Antiphon*, Vol. 14. Issue 2, 2010, pp. 230-235

⁶ Ibid. p. 232

⁷ Ibid. p. 233

⁸ Ibid. pp. 231-232

His argument, here, is that even though Saint Paul was writing to a Greek speaking audience where ‘the expression was not a common formula of their language’ nevertheless ‘it would be a betrayal [to St Paul] to blot it out in the language of translation’.⁹ Furthermore, Botte has discussed a number of Oriental Christian liturgies where the term “spirit” is used in the same way that it is used in the current version of the Roman Canon.

In addition, the Reverend Monsignor Bruce Harbert, Executive Director of the Secretariat of the International Commission on English in the Liturgy from 2002 to 2009, in an interview on *Become One Body One Spirit in Christ*, noted the choice of the term “spirit” in the response ‘And with your spirit’ by also referring to the way that Saint Paul used the term in his letter to the Galatians, ‘May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brothers and sisters’ (Gal 6:18). He continued by claiming that Saint Paul must have been making a point about what constitutes a person because, in another place he referred to a person being spirit, soul and body, ‘May the God of peace make you perfect and holy; and may you all be kept safe and blameless, spirit, soul and body, for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ’ (1 Th. 4: 23). If there were this distinction within a person then there must be something special in regards to the spirit of a person. In the same interview, Monsignor Harbert then referred to Saint Paul’s Letter to the Galatians to clarify what was special about this “spirit”; which he did by examining the fruits of the spirit, which include: ‘love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, trustfulness, gentleness and self-control’ (Gal 5: 22). He then continued with the understanding that ‘the spirit of a human being is that part in us which is closest to God and most open and receptive to the gifts of God’¹⁰ so that one’s response “And with your spirit” is ‘affirming that our meeting is animated by the Holy Spirit’.¹¹ In fact, Monsignor Harbert takes this Spirit animated response to another, deeper level by paraphrasing Saint John Chrysostom:

that the people say this (“And with your spirit”) because they recognise the gift of the Holy Spirit given to (the priest) at ordination which enables him to continue and say the Eucharistic Prayer ... but of course the people would not be able to say that had they

⁹ Ibid. p. 232

¹⁰ Bruce Harbert, ‘Commentary on the Text’ from *Changes to the Roman Missal Text*, in the section: Receiving this English Translation, on the DVD *Become One Body One Spirit in Christ*, ICEL, Fraynetwork Multimedia (2010)

¹¹ Ibid.

themselves not been filled by the Holy Spirit and gathered by the Holy Spirit to worship God in the Eucharistic Prayer.¹²

The people's response to '*Dominus vobiscum*' then, is pregnant with meaning and history and goes well beyond an understanding of the response in 1974 of, 'And also with you'.

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
V/. Dominus vobiscum	The priest begins the Eucharistic prayer. With hands extended he sings or says: The Lord be with you.	V/. The Lord be with you.
R/. Et cum spiritu tuo. V/. Sursum corda.	The people answer: And also with you. He lifts up his hands and continues: Lift up your hearts.	R/. And with your spirit. V/. Lift up your hearts.
R/. Habemus ad Dominum.	People: We lift them up to the Lord. With hands extended, he continues:	R/. We lift them up to the Lord.
V/. Gratias agamus Domino, Deo nostro.	Let us give thanks to the Lord our God. People:	V/. Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.
R/. Dignum et iustum est.	It is right to give him thanks and praise. The priest continues the Preface with hands extended.	R/. It is right and just. There follows the Preface indicated by the rubrics,

In the same dialogue before the Preface, all the Latin texts have the response to the celebrant's '*Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro*' as '*Dignum et iustum est*'. In the 1974 translation, the Latin was paraphrased, probably on the strength of the idea in the preceding acclamation, which invited one to give thanks to God, was appropriate because the response was, 'It is right to give him thanks and praise'. Normally, the anomaly in translation might not be significant; it certainly is good to give God thanks and praise but something different is conveyed with the use of the term "just". Justice is the cardinal moral virtue that consists in the constant and firm will to give one's due to God and to one's neighbour.¹³ The Preface dialogue and the first words of the Preface proper confess that right relationship *is* (that is, consists in) giving thanks to God always and everywhere – that is acknowledging God's justice, a theme that is carried forward in the first line of the Preface when the celebrant continues, 'It is truly right and just'.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ CCC 1807

What is at issue here is God's righteousness and justice, themes that will be taken up in later, in Chapter 4, in this thesis.

The term "just" originated from the Latin word "*ius*" meaning "right law", implying to do what is morally right or righteous¹⁴. Theologically, then, the term refers to someone being considered or made righteous by God who should in justice condemn us for our offences but in mercy and by his grace forgives and accepts us. The Book of Wisdom gives us, the faithful, this confidence about God's forbearance: 'Two lessons your people were to learn from these dealings of yours (of God); ever should justice and mercy go hand in hand, never should your own children despair of forestalling your justice by repentance' (Wisdom 12: 19).

The "Sanctus" acclamation is a moment when the congregation with one voice join their voices with the choirs of angels in heaven in honour and praise of God. In this prayer the importance of punctuation in the current translation can be ascertained by the way the full stop, colon, semi-colon and comma have been employed to convey meaning and, in turn, a theological understanding of the Prayer in its final version.

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
	ACCLAMATION	
Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus Dominus, Deus Sabaoth. Pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua. Hosanna in excelsis. Benedictus, qui venit in nomine Domini. Hosanna in excelsis.	At the end of the Preface, he joins his hands, and, together with the people, concludes it by singing: Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.	There follows the Preface indicated by the rubrics, which concludes: Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God of hosts. Heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.

As can be noted from here there are a number of times when the full stop has been used in the former translation when the 2010 translation uses no punctuation or another form of punctuation to suggest continuity and inclusivity and, in fact, reproduces the

¹⁴ In Latin *ius* means "right" or "law". In English "just" comes from the cognate adjective *iustus*: See *A Latin Dictionary founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary Revised, Enlarged, And in Great Part Rewritten*, Charlton T. Lewis & Charles Short (eds.), s.v *jus* (2) I, p. 1019 col. 1-2

punctuation of the Third Typical Edition. Indeed, in the 2010 translation in the Acclamation after the Preface a full stop ends the first statement about God and clarifies the point better than the 1974 translation because it makes the point that God is Lord – ‘Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God of hosts’. In the 1974 translation a comma is used between the words “Lord” and “God” which has the force of placing the phrase “God of power and might” in parenthesis which, in turn, can be interpreted as a subsidiary statement about God; even an after-thought. Indeed, the use of capitals in the proclamation of God – ‘Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God...’ (Current version) attests that God is holy by announcing the attribute thrice and as part of his status as God! Whereas, the prayer in the Paul VI (1974) translation read, ‘Holy, holy, holy Lord,...’, which suggests that God is holy by emphasising and describing this fact three times.

Then, there was a rejoinder to the acclamation – ‘God of power and might’ – which, being separated by a comma between “Lord” and “God” had the effect of the last statement being placed in parenthesis and connecting the acclamation (Holy, holy, holy Lord, ...) with ‘heaven and earth are full of your glory’. This implies that we, at Mass, as a people, are addressing God as “Holy Lord” and making a statement of fact – that heaven and earth are full of his glory! This anomaly has been clarified in the 2010 translation of the prayer by deleting the comma between the words “Lord” and “God” and by separating the two concepts – of the holiness of God and the response of all his creatures - and to give reason to praise God in the statement that follows, ‘Hosanna in the highest’ by all his creatures.

Language, too, is important in conveying meaning and purpose in the First Eucharistic Prayer. In the 1974 version, the ‘Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth.’ was translated from Latin as: ‘Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, ...’ and although the translation was consistent with the use of capitals and lower-case in the translation of “Holy, holy, holy Lord”, it translated the term “Sabaoth” as ‘power and might’ when, in the translation that was available in the missalettes, the term was translated as “hosts”, which, according to the *New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, has two meanings: an army or a large number. This interpretation is supported by McKenzie in that “Sabaoth” ‘means an army ready for war’ with the understanding that this army is drawn from the general population rather than a standing, professional army, implying that God is ‘Yahweh of hosts’¹⁵. In this context

¹⁵ John L. McKenzie, *Dictionary of the Bible* 2nd Edition, (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1985) p. 374

then, ‘Lord God of hosts’ is a reference to God as Lord over earthly or heavenly “armies” – in other words people arrayed behind God. The translation approved by Pope Paul VI in 1974 was an apparent deviation from the intention of the original and that anomaly in translation has been restored in the 2010 version of the Eucharistic Prayer with the restoration of the term “hosts”. In addition, there was no comma in the Latin texts between “Lord” and “God” suggesting, as does the current Latin version of the Eucharistic Prayer and its translation, that the appropriate salutation should be “Lord God”.

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
Te igitur, clementissime Pater, per Iesum Christum, Filium tuum, Dominum nostrum, supplices rogamus, ac petimus, ...	The priest, with hands extended says: Celebrant alone We come to you, Father, with praise and thanksgiving, through Jesus Christ your Son.	The Priest, with hands extended, says: To you, therefore, most merciful Father, we make humble prayer and petition through Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord:

The Roman Canon continues with the words, “*Te igitur*”, which the translation authorised by Pope Paul VI in 1974 was rendered, ‘We come to you, Father,’ and then an additional phrase was added: ‘with praise and thanksgiving’. Not only was this a very free translation of the Latin version of the Eucharistic Prayer¹⁶, it also comes across as a statement of fact rather than a posture before God – creature before creator – which was lost in translation; and which has been rectified in the 2010 translation of the Eucharistic Prayer. Indeed, the continuation of the Eucharistic Prayer after the Preface in its current form is more accurate than that which was given in 1974.

Firstly, the current translation states, ‘To you, therefore, most merciful Father,’ which has the momentum of continuing the thoughts and prayers of the priest and people that preceded it as it follows upon the last words of the *Sanctus*, “Hosanna in the highest”. This comes across by the use of the phrase “To you, therefore” – which not only more accurately translates “*Te igitur*” but also has an inferential value – in that it draws together what was stated in the dialogue of the Acclamation and what was said in

¹⁶ In Latin the prayer begins, ‘*Te igitur, clementissime Pater, per Iesum Christum, Filium tuum, Dominum nostrum, supplices rogamus, ac petimus, ...*’

the Preface. The phrase “To you, therefore” has the force of connecting the ideas of the prayer of the Preface with the rest of the Eucharistic Prayer whereas the translation of 1974 had the effect of beginning anew the Eucharistic Prayer.

Secondly, the use of adjectives, which is absent in the 1974 translation but figures prominently in the 2010 translation of the Eucharistic Prayer says something profound about mankind’s relationship before God. In the first instance, the terms “most” and “merciful” are applied to God as Father in the 2010 translation which has the effect of softening the stance that was taken in the 1974 translation which boldly stated, ‘We come to you, Father, with praise and thanksgiving’. The 2010 translation of the Eucharistic Prayer has restored the proper and appropriate posture of us, as creatures before God, by applying adjectives to our address to the Father. This stance of humility is continued in the current version when ‘we make humble prayer and petition through Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord’. Again, the use of the term “humble” in reference to the nouns “prayer” and “petition” has the force of not presuming that our prayers will be heard and accepted. Of course, when we pray the Eucharistic Prayer – indeed prayers throughout the Mass – we are addressing ourselves to God. However, we cannot presume that we are on the same level as God when we communicate with Him. According to the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, human beings are His creatures¹⁷ and the language of the Eucharistic Prayer, the great prayer of thanksgiving, has to portray our appropriate posture before God, which is, at this time of the Mass, on one’s knees – in a posture of humility and pleading. It should also be noted that this prayer is being offered to the Father through Jesus Christ, His Son. In the 1974 translation, this fact is made quite plainly with, ‘...through Jesus Christ your Son’. However, in the 2010 translation, ‘our Lord’ is added. This addition has the attraction of including the faithful in the relationship of Jesus to the Father when one prays this prayer to God.

Now, when one looks closely at the punctuation between the two versions one can see that the 1974 translation ends with a full stop whereas the 2010 translation has a colon. Now normally this might not be very profound but in this situation it is. The colon is used to indicate an enumeration¹⁸ of that for which we are praying, that is ‘that you accept and bless these gifts...which we offer you...’ which contrasts with the idea that preceded it namely, that our humble prayer and petition are made through Jesus

¹⁷ See CCC Nos 343 and 344 and although we are the summit of God’s creation, we, like all creatures of God owe Him homage, praise and thanksgiving.

¹⁸ Op. cit., *Oxford Guide to English Grammar*, № 56 (3 f)

Christ. In the Latin text, this part of the prayer finishes with a comma, which has the impetus of continuing the prayer rather than stopping the prayer altogether as is the case with a full stop. The gifts of bread and wine that we are offering would not under other circumstances become the Body and Blood of Christ unless Christ himself had made it possible for these to become so. Therefore, the use of the colon is not only appropriate; it is necessary because it helps promote the continuity of the idea begun at the beginning of the Eucharistic Prayer – that our prayers will be acceptable by the Father through the intervention of His Son.

The language of this prayer has a profound impact on what is conveyed in the prayer. In Latin the following prayer is: ‘*uti accepta habeas et benedicas, ✠ hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia illibata*’...

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
uti accepta habeas et benedicas, hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia illibata,	Through him we ask you to accept and bless + these gifts we offer you in sacrifice.	that you accept and bless ✠ these gifts, these offerings, these holy and unblemished sacrifices,

Because of the full stop at the end of the introductory sentence in the 1974 translation, the prayer has to continue with a new sentence with its subject. The subject of this new sentence is “we”. This places inordinate influence on what humanity can achieve. In the 2010 translation, the prayer of the priest, with the silent approval of the congregation, is prefaced with an attitude of humility and petition that God accept the bread and wine on the altar. The dynamics of this prayer is reversed; the prayer is ours, but the action is reserved for God – ‘that you accept and bless these gifts’¹⁹. Secondly, it is important that the use of adjectives to describe the gifts as ‘holy and unblemished sacrifices’, which is a direct translation of ‘*sancta sacrificia illibata*’, be noted with the proviso that “and” can be absent in Latin whereas the conjunction is needed in English. Recalling the Book of Exodus, God commanded Moses to instruct the people that when choosing the Passover lamb, ‘It must be an animal without blemish, a male one year old; you must take it from either sheep or goats’ (Ex 12: 5). Moses, in the Book of Leviticus, in keeping with the precedent set, instructs the people that for all other

¹⁹ The Latin states, ‘*uti accepta habeas, et benedicas hæc dona...*’

sacrifices, the kinds of sacrifices that were permitted to be offered to God, were unblemished male animals from either the herd or of the flock (see Lev 1: 3 and 10). Our offerings of bread and wine are symbolic of the best of our produce. As the prayers at the Offertory reminded us, ‘the bread we offer you: fruit of the earth and work of human hands, it will become for us the bread of life’; (similarly), the wine we offer: fruit of the vine and work of human hands, it will become our spiritual drink’. By invoking the unblemished status of our gifts, we are offering God the best of our produce and handiwork because we know that after the consecration these will be the Body and Blood of Christ – the perfect and unblemished sacrifice offered to God.

According to the 2010 translation of the Eucharistic Prayer, the sentence does not end here but continues with the purpose of our offering. In the 1974 translation, there is a new sentence:

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
in primis, quae tibi offerimus pro Ecclesia tua sancta catholica: quam pacificare, custodire, adunare et regere digneris toto orbe terrarum: una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro N. et Antistite nostro N. et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicae et apostolicae fidei cultoribus.	We offer them for your holy catholic Church, watch over it, Lord, and guide it; grant it peace and unity throughout the world. We offer them for N. our pope, for N. our bishop, and for all who hold and teach the catholic faith that comes to us from the apostles.	which we offer you firstly for your holy catholic Church. Be pleased to grant her peace, to guard, unite and govern her throughout the whole world, together with your servant N. our Pope and N. our Bishop,* and all those who, holding to the truth, hand on the catholic and apostolic faith.

The object of this humble prayer and petition in the current version of the Eucharistic Prayer is that ‘*your* holy catholic Church’ is the first beneficiary. The reason that we pray for her is that she is the Bride of Christ and stands in a unique relationship with God, through Christ. And the purpose of our sacrifice is so that God may grant the Church peace, and guard her and unite and govern her through the Magisterium. God is the guarantor of these petitions and, in the context of the sentence; the hierarchy of the Church is understood to be working with God in these matters.

In the 1974 translation, the first sentence makes the point that the sacrifice is similarly offered for ‘your holy catholic Church’ with a concomitant request for guidance, peace and unity. The effect of separating this request from the prayer for the Magisterium is to create a gap between the purpose of the sacrifice and those working with God for peace and unity. In the 1974 translation, the faithful were praying for the Pope and the local ordinary ‘and for all who hold and teach the catholic faith that comes to us from the apostles’. The implication of this translation from Latin is that it is not clear that one is praying exclusively for the Catholic Church or another Christian community. The reason for that is in the syntax. By referring to the faith ‘that comes to us from the apostles’ implies that the Catholic faith originated from the apostles; but so, too, can other Christian denominations and communities claim the same. However, through the use of the adjective “apostolic”, the 2010 translation of the Eucharistic Prayer has rectified the anomaly in the 1974 translation and rendered the catholic faith to apostolic origins. This is not a matter of semantics; there is an important truth behind the use of the adjective “apostolic”. By using the adjective in reference to the catholic faith, the faithful, in the Eucharistic Prayer are making a claim that the Faith that we profess and that has been passed down to us is the Faith that was given the apostles by Christ – it is not some version or interpretation of the Christian Faith. The force of the conjunction “and” coming after the prayers for the Pope and the Bishop is that it may include both Catholic and Orthodox expressions of ‘the truth’ of the Faith without specifically saying so. However, the essential point at the heart of the prayer and the use of the term “and” is that there is communion between the hierarchy and the members of the Body of Christ.

The Roman Canon – The Commemoration of the Living

The next section of the Eucharistic Prayer is entitled the commemoration of the living.

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
Memento, Domine, famulorum famularumque tuarum N. et N. et omnium circumstantium,	Remember, Lord, your people, especially those for whom we now pray, N. and N. Remember all of us gathered here before you.	Remember, Lord, your servants N. and N. and all gathered here, whose faith and devotion are known to you. For them we offer you this sacrifice of praise

quorum tibi fides
 cognita est et
 nota devotio, pro
 quibus tibi
 offerimus: vel
 qui tibi offerunt
 hoc sacrificium
 laudis, pro se
 suisque omnibus:
 pro redemptione
 animarum
 suarum, pro spe
 salutis et
 incolumitatis
 suae: tibi que
 reddunt vota sua
 aeterno Deo,
 vivo et vero.

You know how firmly we
 believe in you
 and dedicate ourselves to
 you.
 We offer you this
 sacrifice of praise
 for ourselves and those
 who are dear to us.
 We pray to you, our
 living and true God,
 for our well being and
 redemption.

or they offer it for
 themselves
 and all who are dear to
 them:
 for the redemption of
 their souls,
 in hope of health and
 well-being,
 and paying their homage
 to you,
 the eternal God, living
 and true.

The 2010 translation more closely follows the Latin version of the Eucharistic Prayer than does the 1974 translation. The significance of this is in some of the language used and the effect of punctuation. In the Latin text, the words ‘*Memento Domine, famulorum famularumque tuarum...*’ could be translated as, ‘Be mindful, O Lord, of your male servants and female servants’. The decision to agree on a common term for servants to include both men and women is understandable in the present climate for inclusive language. However, that does not take away from the fact that the word “servant” has a particular meaning and establishes a relationship that is more expressive of the relationship that exists in the Christian community between individual persons and God that is not present in the use of the word “people”, which was the word chosen in the 1974 translation.

Besides this, there is a profound difference in what the celebrant prays in the 2010 translation when he says, ‘For them we offer you this sacrifice of praise or they offer it for themselves and all who are dear to them’ and what the translation of 1974 conveyed. Firstly, the celebrant is praying the Eucharistic Prayer on behalf of himself and of the whole Church – especially those gathered in this celebration. Therefore, when he prays, ‘for them we offer you this sacrifice of praise’, he is referring to those named above, including those gathered, in the special commemoration for prayers at this Mass. He then continues, ‘or they offer it for themselves...’ which is an important corollary in the sequence of the prayer. According to Pope Pius XII in *Mediator Dei*:

The unbloody immolation at the words of consecration, when Christ is made present upon the altar in the state of a victim, is performed by the priest and by him alone, as the representative of Christ and not as the representative of the faithful. But it is because the priest places the divine victim upon the altar that he offers it to God the Father as an oblation for the glory of the Blessed Trinity and for the good of the whole Church. Now the faithful participate in the oblation, understood in this limited sense, after their own fashion and in a twofold manner, namely, because they not only offer the sacrifice by the hands of the priest, but also, to a certain extent, in union with him. It is by reason of this participation that the offering made by the people is also included in liturgical worship.²⁰

Jungmann summarises the teaching as the faithful offering the sacrifice not only at the hands of the priest, but also, to a certain extent, in union with him.²¹ Furthermore, the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* states:

Now the center and summit of the entire celebration begins: namely, the Eucharistic Prayer, that is, the prayer of thanksgiving and sanctification. The priest invites the people to lift up their hearts to the Lord in prayer and thanksgiving; he unites the congregation with himself in the prayer that he addresses in the name of the entire community to God the Father through Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit.²²

Therefore, this important role of the faithful as active participants in the offering of the sacrifice, which was lost, has been reinserted in the current translation of the Eucharistic Prayer. This 1974 translation paraphrased into three sentences our belief and dedication to God; an offering of this sacrifice by the priest ‘for ourselves and those dear to us’; and for our wellbeing and redemption. All the action of the prayer is focused on the priest. The force of the use of the term “themselves” reinforces the participatory nature of the faithful in the Eucharistic Prayer, which was lost by the use of the term “ourselves”. *Lumen Gentium* states this succinctly when it says, “”.

Included in the commemoration of the living, is the “*Communicantes*” a prayer that honours particular saints.

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
Communicantes, et memoriam venerantes, in	In union with the whole Church we honour Mary,	In communion with those whose memory we venerate,

²⁰ Pius XII, Papal Encyclical, *Mediator Dei*, (1947) § 92

²¹ Josef A. Jungmann, *The Mass*, (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1976) p. 127

²² Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *The General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, (23 July 2010), §78

primis gloriosae
 semper Virginis
 Mariae,
 Genetricis Dei
 et Domini nostri
 Iesu Christi: sed
 et beati Ioseph,
 eiusdem
 Virginis Sponsi,
 et beatorum
 Apostolorum ac
 Martyrum
 tuorum, Petri et
 Pauli, Andreae,
 (Iacobi, Ioannis,
 Thomae, Iacobi,
 Philippi,
 Bartholomaei,
 Matthaei,
 Simonis et
 Thaddaei: Lini,
 Cleti, Clementis,
 Xysti, Cornelii,
 Cypriani,
 Laurentii,
 Chrysogoni,
 Ioannis et Pauli,
 Cosmae et
 Damiani) et
 omnium
 Sanctorum
 tuorum; quorum
 meritis
 precibusque
 concedas, ut in
 omnibus
 protectionis tuae
 muniamur
 auxilio. (Per
 Christum
 Dominum
 nostrum.
 Amen.)

the ever-virgin mother of
 Jesus Christ our Lord and
 God.
 We honour Joseph, her
 husband,
 the apostles and martyrs
 Peter and Paul, Andrew,
 (James, John, Thomas,
 James, Philip,
 Bartholomew, Matthew,
 Simon and Jude;
 we honour Linus, Cletus,
 Clement, Sixtus,
 Cornelius, Cyprian,
 Lawrence, Chrysogonus,
 John and Paul, Cosmas
 and Damian)
 and all the saints.
 May their merits and
 prayers
 gain us your constant help
 and protection.
 (Through Christ our Lord.
 Amen.)

especially the glorious
 ever-Virgin Mary,
 Mother of our God and
 Lord, Jesus Christ,
 † and blessed Joseph, her
 Spouse, your blessed
 Apostles and Martyrs,
 Peter and Paul, Andrew,
 [James, John,
 Thomas, James, Philip,
 Bartholomew, Matthew,
 Simon and Jude;
 Linus, Cletus, Clement,
 Sixtus,
 Cornelius, Cyprian,
 Lawrence, Chrysogonus,
 John and Paul,
 Cosmas and Damian]
 and all your Saints;
 we ask that through their
 merits and prayers,
 in all things we may be
 defended
 by your protecting help.
 [Through Christ our Lord.
 Amen.]

The first point to note is that in the current version of the translation, this prayer is one, long sentence with the subject of the sentence ‘we ask that through their merits and prayers...’ coming towards the end of the statement. This changes the dynamics of the prayer when compared with the 1974 translation. This latter translation broke up the

prayer into three sentences beginning with honouring Mary; followed by honouring Saint Joseph and a selection of saints; and concluding with a petition prayer for God's 'constant help and protection'. The effect of having three sentences is that there are three separate, albeit inter-related, statements which stymies the flow of the general idea of using their intercessory powers. The active voice of the verbs used implies that the action is done by the priest. In the current translation, because the verb is also in the active voice 'we ask that through their merits and prayers...' it contains the quality of expressing the idea that our prayer is united to that of Mary, Saint Joseph and the saints listed, the effect of which is that these more powerful voices are interceding on our behalf before God.

The beginnings of both translations of the prayer are also significant. The grammar in Latin of "*Communicantes, et memoriam venerantes*": is: "Having a share in, and venerating the memory of, in the first place to the glorious ever Virgin ... may you grant (*concedas*) that we may be defended (*muniamur*) in all things by the help of your protection", has been summarised as "in union with" (1974) and translated as "in communion with" (2010) – the idea behind the prayer in Latin is retained in 2010. The terms "union" and "communion" are significant. The term "union" certainly conveys a sense of unity and it implies a unity with the Church of the living and of the dead – "the whole Church"- and yet it has its limitation. The word "communion" more clearly conveys the Latin text and better expresses the idea that is being conveyed especially in reference to holy people (*sancti*) and holy things (*sancta*)²³; this unity of faith and charity implied by Saint James²⁴ is achieved through participation in the Eucharist.²⁵ We are fully incorporated into the divine life of Christ and His Body, the Church, by the supreme gift of His ever-loving, self-sacrificing grace, through the Holy Spirit. So, "communion" means more than a sharing of ideas and beliefs about Christ being the messiah and the role of Mary in salvation history for it points to the reality that we already have through Baptism and the promise that we will experience what Mary already does through her having been faithful to God.

²³ See CCC 948

²⁴ See *The Letter of James*, James 2:14-26

²⁵ See CCC 957, which states: *Communion with the saints*. "It is not merely by the title of example that we cherish the memory of those in heaven; we seek, rather, that by this devotion to the exercise of fraternal charity the union of the whole Church in the Spirit may be strengthened. Exactly as Christian communion among our fellow pilgrims brings us closer to Christ, so our communion with the saints joins us to Christ, from whom as from its fountain and head issues all grace, and the life of the People of God itself".

The impact of Mary's role and influence in salvation history, as conveyed by the two translations, will be examined now – she is both Mother of Christ and Mother of the Church.²⁶ In the 1974 translation the prayer continued with, 'we honour Mary, the ever-virgin mother of Jesus Christ our Lord and God' with the stated claim that Mary is the mother of Jesus and the implication that he happens to be God. What comes across in the preferential choice of phrases is that she is the mother of Jesus first and that he is our Lord and God is added. The current translation states that 'we venerate, especially the glorious, ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of God (the Theotokos) and our Lord Jesus Christ'. Mary's status as God-bearer is acknowledged first and then who he is, our Lord Jesus Christ. Secondly, the two ways that "ever-virgin" is expressed is also meaningful: "ever-virgin" in lower case lettering conveys the idea that Mary is forever a virgin which description of her is true and yet is not as rich as the current translation. The current translation overcomes the need to describe her situation by addressing her as the "Virgin Mary" with capital letters and the adjective "ever" attached to the noun, "Virgin" with the aid of a hyphen. In this latter case, the use of the capital "V" in addressing Mary is to give her the title "Virgin", which is both scripturally accurate and is supported by Church teaching.²⁷ Hence, by inserting "ever" into the title in lower case is making a statement of fact the Mary remains always a virgin. Finally, the use of the terms "honour" and "venerate" also convey different meanings. The word "honour" conveys the idea that one pays respect to or demonstrates esteem for someone or highly respects him or her. The word "venerate", on the other hand, conveys the idea to regard someone with deep respect; and to revere him or her on account of his or her sanctity. Therefore, the word "venerate" used in the current translation of the Eucharistic Prayer is a better word because it implies the high regard that we have for Mary, Joseph and the apostles and martyrs named.

In the 1974 translation as noted above, Mary is mentioned in the first of the three sentences and in the next sentence, Saint Joseph and the apostles and martyrs are named. In separating Mary from Saint Joseph in particular and from the apostles and martyrs was probably a statement about the status of Mary. However, none of the Latin versions of the Eucharistic Prayer and the current translation separate these saintly people – the Latin text employs other forms of punctuation to convey the unity of these

²⁶ See CCC 963

²⁷ CCC Nos 496 and 499 and affirmed by *Lumen Gentium* 57 which states 'this union (of the Mother with the Son in the work of salvation) is manifest...at the birth of Our Lord, who did not diminish His mother's virginal integrity but sanctified it'.

people in this prayer.²⁸ The current version of the translation, as noted above, avoids the use of the full stop until the end of the prayer so that Mary, Saint Joseph, the apostles and martyrs are included together in our petition to join our prayers to theirs. By using another sentence to introduce a new list of saints – including Saint Joseph – also has the unfortunate consequence of separating him from Mary. In the current translation of the Eucharistic Prayer Saint Joseph’s close relationship with Mary (and through Mary with Jesus) is maintained in two ways: through the use of the comma after “Jesus Christ” and followed by the conjunction “and”.

Another important distinction between the 1974 translation and the current translation of the Roman Canon is that the current translation, following the Latin text, employs a capital “S” for the word spouse when referring to Saint Joseph which suggests the importance placed on him in relation to Mary. The 1974 translation referred to Saint Joseph as “her husband”. Now the term “*Sponsi*” in the phrase “*eiusdem Virginis Sponsi*” has a particular meaning in Latin. The composers of the text of the Roman Canon may have been influenced by the text of the Gospels of Luke for their interpretation and understanding of the relationship between Mary and Joseph because the term “*sponsi*” is the genitive singular masculine of “*sponsus*” which is the perfect passive of “*spondeo*” meaning, “I make a solemn promise”.²⁹ In this way an intimate relationship existed between Joseph and Mary, which the Church interpreted as betrothed; a man and a woman who were betrothed were husband and wife in the Jewish religion in the time of Mary and Joseph.³⁰ Hence there is no contradiction between the two translations in calling Saint Joseph her husband or spouse: ‘When his (Jesus’) mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit; and her husband Joseph, being a just man ...’ (Matt. 1: 18-19) and in the 1974 translation of the Roman Canon when Saint Joseph is referred to as her betrothed, ‘In the sixth month, the angel Gabriel was sent from God ... to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph...’ (Lk. 1: 26-28).³¹

²⁸ See Appendices “A” to “G” of this thesis

²⁹ Op. cit., Lewis & Short, ‘*spondeo*’, p. 1746

³⁰ Dr. J. H. Hertz, *the Pentateuch and Haftorahs* Hebrew text, English Translation and Commentary, 2nd Ed., p. 844

³¹ Peter M J Stravinskis, ‘Defending the New Roman Missal: A Response to Father Michael Ryan’ *Antiphon*, Vol. 14, Issue 1, (2010), pp. 145-146 states: ‘One reason the church was reluctant to highlight Saint Joseph until relatively recent centuries was the fear that his relationship to Mary would or could be misunderstood. And so when Pope John XXIII added Joseph’s name to the Canon, it was determined that no one should be led into error or confusion, thus giving us “of the same Virgin”. Which is to say, that while Joseph and Mary were indeed husband and wife, Mary remained a virgin – a critical theological point’.

Then follows a list of some of the apostles and martyrs; and here, again, language is important. In the 1974 translation, because there is a new sentence beginning with honouring Saint Joseph, the list continues with the definite article “the”. The use of the definite article in relation to the apostles and martyrs has the effect of depersonalising them and isolating them not only in our prayer but also from other worthy saints. Because this list of saints is in a separate sentence, they appear as an appendix to the intercessory prayer of Mary. We need to keep in the forefront of our minds that this prayer is being made through Christ our Lord and that we are relying on the merits and prayers of Mary and this group of saints to intercede for us. In the current translation, since the whole prayer is one sentence, the list of saints with Mary is inclusive but the list is made more personal with the use of the word “your” in reference to the apostles and martyrs (even though the word does not appear in the Latin text). As stated previously, the prayer is being made through Christ our Lord so that the reference to ‘your blessed Apostles and Martyrs’ makes the prayer more personal from our perspective in that we are referencing these outstanding individuals as his own and imploring them to intercede for us. The current version suggests a continuation and inclusivity of those people named as part of the prayer as a whole.

Finally, the prayer comes to a conclusion in a new sentence with: ‘we ask that ...’ in the 1974 translation. The meaning and focus of the prayer is different from the Latin version and its current translation. The prayer in the 1974 translation concludes, ‘May their merits and prayers gain us your constant help and protection’. The dynamics of this prayer is that through the prayers of these saints we may be given the constant help and protection of God. This is not exactly what the Latin states in the Eucharistic Prayer.³² The dynamics of the prayer in its current form, which corresponds to the Latin text, is more complex.³³ Firstly, as mentioned above, the subject of the prayer occurs near the end of the prayer with ‘we ask that...’, which is in the present tense; this prayer

³² The Latin text reads: ‘*quorum meritis precibusque concedas, ut in omnibus protectionis tuæ muniamur auxilio*’.

³³ In the 1974 translation the syntax of the prayer is expressed as one would expect a prayer to be structured in the English language – with short sentences to construct and convey the idea inherent in the prayer. Characteristically, in Latin, the verb occurs at the end of a sentence and in this prayer, in Latin, this is a long sentence with everything predicated before the subject and the verb of the sentence. According to *Ratio Translationis*, the English translation should maintain the style from Latin into English (see paragraph 113) which is supported by *Liturgiam Authenticam* paragraphs 5, 25, 57 and 59. To that end, *RT* also states that the ‘extended subordination in the formula of the prayers in the Latin rite’ ought to be maintained (see paragraph 54) and in *RT* paragraph 55 the reason for the “extended subordination” being used in the English translation rather than breaking it up into separate sentences is given. The 2010 translation does this and, therefore, is closer to the intention and idea expressed in the prayer as expressed in Latin.

is a long sentence with an extended predicate. We are asking that through the merits and prayers of those persons mentioned in the extended predicate ‘we may be defended’, which is using the passive voice of the verb. This prayer continues the address to God as Father and through the use of the passive voice, we are entreating God not only directly through the venerable people named, but also, through the use of the passive voice, we are not taking anything for granted but, in fact, leaving this prayer at the mercy of God – and as a sign of hope, this prayer is made through the intercession of Christ our Lord. Therefore, the language and the use of punctuation have promoted an appropriate posture of humility before God.

The proper forms of the *Communicantes* will be discussed in the next chapter in conjunction with their corresponding Prefaces in a discussion and analysis of the theology of God conveyed in the Roman Canon.

The Roman Canon – The *Hanc Igitur* prayer

In both the 1974 translation and the current translation, the Eucharistic Prayer begins with God the Father being addressed; at the *Communicantes*, both prayers address God as Lord; then, at the *Hanc Igitur*, the 1974 translation reverts back to addressing God as Father, whilst the current translation continues to address God as Lord which is closer to the Latin text. The purpose of the prayer is to make three petitions of God: to have peace in our days, to be delivered from eternal damnation, and to be numbered amongst the chosen.

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostrae, sed et cunctae familiae tuae, quaesumus, Domine, ut placatus accipias: diesque nostros in tua pace disponas, atque ab aeterna damnatione nos eripi et in electorum tuorum iubeas	Father, accept this offering from your whole family. Grant us your peace in this life, save us from final damnation, and count us among those you have chosen. (Through Christ our Lord. Amen.)	Therefore, Lord, we pray: graciously accept this oblation of our service, that of your whole family; order our days in your peace, and command that we be delivered from eternal damnation and counted among the flock of those you have chosen. [Through Christ our Lord. Amen.]

grege numerari.
(Per Christum
Dominum
nostrum. Amen.)

The *Hanc Igitur* continues the attitude, and prayer, of supplication begun with the *Te igitur* immediately after the *Sanctus*. In beginning the *Hanc Igitur* in the 1974 translation with “Father”, was not only repetitious but also, there was, effectively, a break in the rhythm of the prayer and, in a sense, a new beginning. The rhythm and flow of the prayer has been restored in the current version of the Eucharistic Prayer with the use of “therefore” to begin this prayer. The use of the word “therefore” as an adverb carries the meaning “for that object or purpose” and gives the prayer a sense of continuity. It also has the power of adding impetus to the Eucharistic Prayer by indicating that what had come before is now entering a new stage – towards a climax and this climax is initiated by this prayer.

In addition, the dynamics of the prayer in the current translation has been restored to that which is closer to that which has been prayed by the Church in Latin. Whereas the 1974 translation has three sentences and three petitions: the current version of the prayer is contained in one sentence and begins with a prayer addressed to God ‘Therefore, Lord, we pray’. This approach comes across as humble, an appropriate attitude before God, which is different from the 1974 translation. This prayer begins with, ‘Father, accept this offering’ where the use of the verb “accept” can be interpreted in two ways: as an imperative or as a performative verb. If the verb is understood to be imperative then what is being conveyed is that God is being commanded to accept the offering; if it were to be interpreted as a performative verb then “accept” is indicating a purpose. In either interpretation, the role of man, vis-à-vis God, is not very humble. In the current translation, because there is a colon after “pray” the following then become a list of petitions – the first of which is that God ‘graciously accepts ...’. This is not an order but rather a polite request. And what are we praying that God politely accepts; we are asking him to accept ‘this oblation of our service’. Now the word “oblation” is more potent than the word “offering” used in the 1974 translation.

According to the *New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* the word “oblation” is the action of offering something to God and specifically in the Christian Church it is the offering of bread and wine in the Eucharist. On the other hand, “offering” signifies a

thing presented or sacrificed to God³⁴ – this could include anything, such as monetary contributions, tributes, and tokens of esteem or gifts. So, the term “oblation” is more specific in meaning and, consequently, more eloquently conveys that for which is prayed. The reference to “service” is here interpreted as a duty that must be performed by us before God in venerating him through this oblation because of the effect of what follows: “that of your whole family”. Finally, the use of the phrase “that of” in preference to “from” is also important. The term “from” indicates a starting point; in this case the offering is from – meaning that the starting point of the offering is “your whole family” – whereas, the phrase “that of ” has implications of “belonging to”; in other words “that of your whole family” conveys the idea that which belongs to your whole family. These words and phrases might seem insignificant but they are not!

The remaining part of the prayer includes the petitions mentioned above. Here, again, the terminology of the two sets of prayers differs and, again, the differences have important implications for mankind’s relationship with God. In the 1974 translation from the Latin text the words “grant”, “save” and “count” are in the imperative form of the verb and have the implication of ordering God to perform these tasks. The current translation is closer to the Latin text in that the polite form of the request “order” is used based on the influence of the prayer offered in the first line of this prayer and on the fact that this is one sentence. Secondly, by using the passive voice in the clause ‘we be delivered from...’ softens the force of the prayer by throwing the onus on God to act upon our prayers. In the context of Christ’s command: ‘love one another as I have loved you’ (Jn. 15:12), our responsibility in this prayer is to align our wills to the will of God. When we pray that the Lord ‘order our days in your peace’, we are asking God to influence the life of man to conform to the peace of God. The word “command” is also influenced by the phrase, “we pray”, and, again, man is beseeching God to bend our wills to the will of God – when God commands, we have the freedom to follow or not. In this prayer we are asking to submit our will to the will of God. Finally, the use of the word “flock” is a reference to the Christian community especially recalling Christ as the Good Shepherd and by inference the congregation in relation to its bishop and pastor.

The Roman Canon – The *Epiclesis*

³⁴ *The New Shorter Oxford Dictionary*, defines the word “offering” as ‘a thing presented or sacrificed to God in worship or devotion; a contribution, especially of money, to a Church’.

At the *Epiclesis* of the Eucharistic Prayer the Holy Spirit is invoked upon the bread and wine so that they will become the Body and Blood of Christ – that is, ‘transubstantiation takes place: The whole substance of the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ our Lord together with His soul and divinity; therefore, the whole Christ is truly, really and substantially contained in the Eucharist’.³⁵ This prayer introduces the *anamnesis*, which is the memorial prayer that makes present the Body and Blood of Christ in the bread and wine offerings. According to Jungmann, ‘In the formal manner of the legal-minded Romans there are enumerated the qualities which we desire for our sacrificial gift in order that it may be pleasing to God: it must be an offering which is blessed and dedicated to God and approved by him; it must be wholly spiritual – that quality which Christian antiquity insisted on as the distinction between Christian and pagan sacrifices; and thus it will be truly worthy of God, as being the body and blood of his well-beloved Son;’³⁶ hence the list of qualities noted in this prayer.

The prayer begins with the words, ‘*Quam oblationem tu, Deus, in omnibus,*’ where a close reading of this prayer would be as follows: We beseech (*quaesumus*) you, God, that you may deign (*digneris*) to make (*facere*) this offering (*quam oblationem*, literally “which offering” that is referring to the offering discussed in the previous prayer, the *Hanc igitur*) blessed, written up, ratified, reasonable, acceptable. The words ‘*benedictam*’ meaning “bless”; ‘*adscriptam*’ meaning “written up”; and ‘*ratam*’ meaning “ratified”; seem to be intended to carry this legal sense. To balance this legal slant as implied by these words, one ought not to forget the theological principle *ex opere operato*, which states that on the basis of the action performed, the objective efficacy and fruitfulness of the Mass and sacraments rests.³⁷

Latin Text

Pope Paul VI (1974

Current (2010 version)

³⁵ CCC 1374: The mode of Christ’s presence under the Eucharistic species is unique... In the most blessed sacrament of the Eucharist “the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ and, therefore, *the whole Christ is truly, really, and substantially* contained”; and CCC 1376: The Council of Trent summarizes the Catholic faith by declaring: “Because Christ our Redeemer said that it was truly his body that he was offering under the species of bread, it has always been the conviction of the Church of God, and this holy Council now declares again, that by the consecration of the bread and wine there takes place a change of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood. This change the holy Catholic Church has fittingly and properly called transubstantiation”.

³⁶ Josef A. Jungmann, *Public Worship*, (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1957) p. 132

³⁷ Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, MD § 36

version)

Quam
oblationem tu,
Deus, in
omnibus,
quaesumus,
benedictam,
adscriptam,
ratam,
rationabilem,
acceptabilemque
facere digneris:
ut nobis Corpus
et Sanguis fiat
dilectissimi Filii
tui, Domini
nostri Iesu
Christi.

Bless and approve our
offering;
make it acceptable to
you,
an offering in spirit and
in truth.
Let it become for us
the body and blood of
Jesus Christ,
your only Son, our Lord.
(Through Christ our
Lord. Amen.)

Be pleased, O God, we
pray,
to bless, acknowledge,
and approve this offering
in every respect;
make it spiritual and
acceptable,
so that it may become for
us
the Body and Blood of
your most beloved Son,
our Lord Jesus Christ.

In the 1974 translation the use of the imperative form of the verbs used – “Bless”, “approve”, “make it...” and “Let it...” – may be interpreted as commands. By using the imperative, God is being asked to do those actions; it seems to attempt to constrain God and implies an enormous presumption on the part of man in his relationship with God. It assumes that man may make demands of God; and in this the formula of the prayer betrays a lack of humility. In the current version of the prayer, the passive voice of the verb is used (Be pleased) where the onus is on God to concur to our prayer. “We pray” is the priest interceding with those present for God to graciously respond to our request that He ‘be pleased ... to bless, acknowledge and approve this offering in every respect’. The use of the phrase ‘in every respect’ implies not only the idea of ‘in spirit and in truth’, which was current in the 1974 translation but also includes all and every other alternative that might be acceptable to God thereby, leaving it open to God. In the 1974 translation, then, a certain freedom was taken by presenting ‘an offering in spirit and in truth’ which, as noted above in the discussion of the current version, is not borne out by the Latin text. The phrase ‘in spirit and in truth’ simply does not occur in the Latin text and it is difficult to see what the phrase is attempting to convey. So, the current translation ‘in every respect’ compares favourably with the Latin translation of ‘*in omnibus, quaesumus*’, which literally means that ‘we beg/beseech (or entreat) in all things’. In other words, in humility, we will leave open the acceptability of the gifts offered and under what conditions they are accepted.

Furthermore, it is in God's providence to make them spiritual; it reinforces that Jesus, in the person of the priest, is giving effect to this prayer.

Finally, the conclusions of this prayer in both versions of the translation closely resemble each other with the current version more closely adhering to the Latin text. The effect of the current version of the translation is to personalise the relationship between God the Father and Christ as his most beloved Son – His only begotten, eternal Son of God. By referring to Christ's Body and Blood in capital letters in this prayer in the current translation, suggests that we recognise that the bread and wine will become the Body and Blood of Christ after the consecration. This is more than mere semantics; by referring to the body and blood of Jesus Christ in lower case could be construed as the body and blood of Jesus in his human body – after his resurrection and because of the institution of the Blessed Sacrament at the Last Supper, one might construe that reference to Christ in the Body and Blood of Christ should be in capital letters. In support of the use of capital letters in reference to the Body and Blood of Christ, *Ratio Translationis* states that in this case, 'capitalization designates not so much the use of a proper name, in the conventional sense, but rather an acknowledgement of the uniqueness or sanctity of what is professed in its solemn liturgical context'.³⁸

The Roman Canon – The *Institution Narrative*

This is the part of the Eucharistic Prayer where the oblation is made.

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
Qui, pridie quam pateretur, accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas, et elevatis oculis in caelum ad te Deum Patrem suum omnipotentem, tibi gratias agens benedixit, fregit, deditque discipulis suis, dicens:	The day before he suffered he took bread in his sacred hands and looking up to heaven, to you, his almighty Father, he gave you thanks and praise. He broke the bread, gave it to his disciples,	On the day before he was to suffer he took bread in his holy and venerable hands, and with eyes raised to heaven to you, O God, his almighty Father, giving you thanks he said the blessing, broke the bread and gave it to his disciples, saying:

³⁸ RT §117

**ACCIPITE, ET
MANDUCATE EX
HOC OMNES:**

**HOC EST ENIM
CORPUS MEUM,
QUOD PRO VOBIS
TRADETUR.**

and said:

TAKE THIS, ALL OF YOU,
AND EAT IT:
THIS IS MY BODY WHICH
WILL BE GIVEN UP FOR
YOU.

TAKE THIS, ALL OF
YOU, AND EAT OF IT,
FOR THIS IS MY
BODY,
WHICH WILL BE
GIVEN UP FOR YOU.

In the clause, ‘on the day before he was to suffer’ the use of the words ‘was to suffer’ is a very particular form of a structure of the verb, in this case to convey a plan. By using “be” plus the infinitive in the past is, in actual fact the present infinitive form of the verb because, at the time of making the original statement ‘on the day before’ it was not clear whether the original plan was carried out or not – hence the structure of the verb (be + infinitive). From our perspective, the plan was carried out; and this prayer is recalling a time in the past that was anticipating an event in the then future. This helps create the memorial where we recall and, at the same time, are present at and participate in this event. This is eminently more purposeful than the 1974 translation which states ‘The day before he suffered...’. This structure is using the simple past tense of the verb (suffer) to convey an event in the past that has been completed in the past. The 1974 translation situates this event in an historical time; at a particular point in time and this event in the past is restricted to the past because of the structure of the verb. The current version of the translation situates the event in the past with a plan or a prediction of a future event in the past from the point of view of the past event before the predicated event happened. And because the event, from our perspective has happened, the structure of the verb more powerfully conveys the action in a unique sequence of events. It places the actors at Mass (now) with Jesus in the past and then with him looking forward to the culmination of that event – from the perspective of Holy Thursday looking forward to the events of Good Friday.

The next clause of the prayer continues the narrative: ‘he took bread in his sacred hands’, which formed the 1974 translation is compared with ‘he took bread in his holy and venerable hands’, which forms the current translation and although both translations convey the gist of what is in the Latin text, the current version has translated the text more literally. Where the Latin text has ‘*accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas*’ the word “*sanctas*” can be translated as “sacred” or “holy” – the current translation has reverted to including “venerable” as well. Jungmann argues that, historically, these phrases were added as ‘phrases expressive of reverence or of

wonder’.³⁹ Even so, the use of the two phrases, “sacred” and “holy” do convey subtleties of meaning where “sacred” in ‘sacred hands’ implies that Christ’s hands were deserving of veneration or respect as of something holy; whereas, the term “holy” in ‘holy and venerable hands’ conveys the idea of free from contamination of sin and evil; of having the essence of being morally and spiritually perfect. Furthermore, by using the term “venerable” in relation to Jesus the word is making the claim that this person has the right to be highly respected on account of his attributes – in this case, that Jesus is the Eternal Son of God.

In the 1974 translation of the prayer, this prayer is broken into two sentences whereas the current translation has only one sentence incorporating the action of the prayer. The 1974 translation continues with ‘and looking up to heaven...’ where the term “looking” / *elevatis* is an ablative absolute and has the force of describing the action of focussing one’s eyes on a particular place and “to” is used as a preposition in relation to the word “heaven”, the focus of the action. In the current translation of the prayer, the action of the prayer continues with the conjunctions “and” and “giving”. In the Latin text, ‘*et elevatis oculis in caelum*’ the word “*elevatis*” is an ablative absolute and means ‘with (eyes / *oculis*) raised’ and describes the motion of the action as it unfolds. The current translation conveys that sequence of events as the action unfolds because it is contained in one sentence and joined with the conjunctions as mentioned. The only other point of note is that ‘he said the blessing’ which was not included in the 1974 translation and, nonetheless, is an important point. The Last Supper was a meal and according to Jewish tradition the male head of the family said the blessing over the bread at meal times. In the context of the Passover meal that Jesus had with his apostles, this blessing increases in its significance because this special meal was not only significant for God’s saving action in the deliverance of the Israelites from slavery into freedom, it was also the opportunity that Christ took to institute the Eucharist. Therefore, the action of blessing the bread is closer to the events of Scripture as reported in the Synoptic Gospels than what the 1974 version translated – ‘he gave you thanks and praise’. This leads into the actual words of consecration.

In the words of consecration, the Scriptural references for the words used are an amalgam of words taken from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke: ‘Take it and eat;’ he said ‘this is my body’ (Mt 26: 26) and ‘This is my body which will be given for you; do

³⁹ Op. cit., *Public Worship*, p. 132

this as a memorial of me' (Lk 22: 19). Even so, there are some subtle variations in the words of consecration used between the two versions of the translation from Latin. In the current translation the words "of" and "for" have been inserted into the formula of the words of consecration. The inclusion of the word "of" in the phrase, "eat of it" has the force of all partaking of the one Bread – we share in the one Bread, the Body of Christ. Similarly, the word "for" is important because it conveys the reason for which it is possible that we are able to eat of it – because this is the Body of Christ. "For" conveys the idea "because". The power of what is conveyed with the use of those two words in the current translation of the prayer has been eroded by their absence in the 1974 translation of the words of consecration.

The prayer of consecration continues with the current translation of the prayer beginning with the words 'in a similar way...' (*Simili modo*) and the prayer is said in two sentences. The two actions of consecrating the bread and the wine are part of the one action – of consecration – which unity is lost in the 1974 translation of the prayer which begins with a new idea 'When supper was ended' and consists of four sentences. 'In a similar way', therefore, contains the quality of uniting the actions of Jesus at the Last Supper where, in the appropriate part of the meal, he blessed and consecrated the bread, now; towards the end of the meal he takes up the chalice and consecrates the wine to become his Blood.

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
<p>Simili modo, postquam cenatum est, accipiens et hunc praeclarum calicem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas: item tibi gratias agens benedixit, deditque discipulis suis, dicens:</p> <p>ACCIPITE ET BIBITE EX EO OMNES:</p> <p>HIC EST ENIM CALIX SANGUINIS MEI NOVI ET AETERNI TESTAMENTI, QUI PRO VOBIS ET PRO MULTIS EFFUNDETUR IN</p>	<p>When supper was ended, he took the cup.</p> <p>Again he gave you thanks and praise, gave the cup to his disciples, and said:</p> <p>TAKE THIS, ALL OF YOU, AND DRINK FROM IT: THIS IS THE CUP OF MY BLOOD, THE BLOOD OF THE</p>	<p>In a similar way, when supper was ended, he took this precious chalice in his holy and venerable hands, and once more giving you thanks, he said the blessing and gave the chalice to his disciples, saying:</p> <p>TAKE THIS, ALL OF YOU, AND DRINK FROM IT, FOR THIS IS THE</p>

REMISSIONEM
PECCATORUM.

HOC FACITE IN MEAM
COMMEMORATIONEM.

NEW AND
EVERLASTING
COVENANT.
IT WILL BE SHED FOR
YOU AND FOR ALL
SO THAT SINS MAY BE
FORGIVEN.
DO THIS IN MEMORY
OF ME.

CHALICE OF MY
BLOOD,
THE BLOOD OF THE
NEW AND ETERNAL
COVENANT,
WHICH WILL BE
POURED OUT FOR
YOU AND FOR
MANY
FOR THE
FORGIVENESS OF
SINS.
DO THIS IN
MEMORY OF ME.

In the 1974 translation, the text of the prayer says “he took the cup” where the current translation (2010), following the Latin text ‘*accipiens et hanc præclarum calicem*’ – where *accipiens* in the consecration of the Chalice is a present participle and it means “taking” – focuses on the precious nature of this “cup”. The current (2010) translation states “he took this precious chalice”, with the focus placed on “precious chalice” (*præclarum calicem*), which is closer and more inclusive of the intention of what the prayer is attempting to convey. The use of the word “cup” in 1974 or the use of “chalice” in 2010 to translate *calicem* is a moot point in that the word in Latin can be translated by either word in English. The question as to why the word “chalice” is used in preference to “cup” in the 2010 translation may have more to do with the sacred nature of the word “chalice” in reference to a special cup holding the precious Blood of Christ. Since *Ratio Translationis* suggests that capitalization of certain selected words convey meaning, at this point in the Mass the chalice simply contains the wine that is to be changed into the Blood of Christ and, so, is rendered in lower case.⁴⁰

In the 1974 translation, the prayer continues with a new sentence beginning with ‘Again he gave you thanks and praise’. A new sentence suggests a new idea, albeit a development in the narrative, and the uses of the simple past tense of the verbs “gave” and “said” convey the idea that this is an event situated and completed in the past. Although, theologically, this is not the intention of the prayer of consecration, the grammatical structure of the prayer implies this conclusion. This anomaly has been avoided in the current translation because the dynamics of the prayer are included in the one sentence and because of the way the verbs have been employed. The present

⁴⁰ RT, §§117, 119 & 120 [iii and ix]

participles of the verbs “giving” and “saying” are used as conjunctions and convey a sense of continuity when other verbs “took”, “said” and “gave” are used in the simple past tense. In this way the action of the prayer is both situated in the past and has relevance for the present. Confirming the continuity of this action, the phrase “once more” implies in addition to and refers to the earlier occasion at the meal when Jesus took the bread and spoke the words of consecration over it – then follows the actual words of consecration.

In the current translation, the words of consecration prayer continue with the preposition “which” being used as a determiner. This term stands in relation to the antecedent “My Blood”. This is better conveyed in the current translation because the idea is communicated in one sentence. In the 1974 translation the idea is broken up into two parts and in two sentences. In the first sentence the idea is that Christ’s Blood is the Blood ‘of the new and everlasting covenant’ and the second idea is expressed in a new sentence namely ‘that it will be shed for you and for all’. Both these ideas are captured in the one sentence in the current translation of the prayer, which emulates the Latin that is also conveyed in a single sentence. However, regardless of whether the ideas are conveyed in one or two sentences, the terminology used in both prayers do have a bearing on the way the prayer is interpreted.

Initially, the use of the words “everlasting” and “eternal” would seem synonymous but in their subtle differences important theological points are being made. The word “everlasting” conveys the meaning that something will last for ever. The implication is that there is a starting point of this lasting for ever – presumably, the time when Jesus originally pronounced these words. The word “eternal” / ‘*aeternus*’ conveys the idea that there was not a time when something did not exist.⁴¹ The presumption here is that this covenant in the Blood of Christ has been in existence for all time and that it has been concretised in time through the Incarnation and the words spoken by Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son of God, at a particular historical moment. Being eternal carries further theological implications, which will be discussed in a later chapter. Similarly, the use of the words “shed” in the 1974 translation, and the use of the term “poured” in the current translation also have important implications for understanding the prayer. The word ‘*effundetur*’ is the future passive indicative meaning “it will be poured forth”. According to the *New Shorter Oxford English*

⁴¹ Op. cit., Lewis & Short, *Latin Dictionary*, defines ‘*aeternus*’ as, “without beginning or end, eternal”, pg. 63

Dictionary, the dictionary meaning for “shed” has five other meanings before the meaning that is synonymous with “poured” is matched. The common meaning of the two words is to emit or discharge in the sense to cause (blood) to flow by cutting or wounding a person. So, although Christ shed his blood for the redemption of mankind, he did so at the hands of other men whereas the term “poured” suggests the action of Christ submitting to and allowing his blood to flow for the salvation of mankind – it ascribes the action to the person performing the action. In addition, by using the word “it” in reference to Christ’s Blood, in the context of a new sentence not only distances itself from the action of the statement; the word “it” also depersonalises the action. “It” is referring to the Blood as an object rather than visualizing the Blood of Christ as being the action of a person pouring out his life for the salvation of mankind.

In addition, there needs to be some discussion on the use of the term “all”, used in the 1974 translation, and the use of the word “many” in the current translation. Just in terms of language, the word “all” carries the meaning that everyone – that no one is excluded from being saved by Christ’s act of redemption. The implication that follows this all-encompassing act is that one does not need to do anything in cooperation with Christ’s saving act – everyone is saved. Alternatively, the word “many” carries the meaning of a great indefinite number and implies that although the number may be great it does not include all. The theology of this anomaly will be discussed in a later chapter suffice it to say here that Manfred Hauke quoting Pope Benedict XVI ‘that Fr. Franz Prosinger (in his doctoral thesis) has demonstrated very clearly that the translation (of the Latin *pro multis* in the institution narrative) should be “for many”, a conclusion that has also been accepted by the rigorous examiners of the Biblical Institute’.⁴² The point that Hauke is making is that although theologically and scripturally the sacrifice of Christ is for all; the words of the narrative need to be honoured and not interpreted. Hauke continues:

The “for many” in Matthew and Mark must be seen in parallel with Luke and Paul, who use the phrase “for you”. The words “for you” refer to the believers in Christ who participate in the Eucharist. The words of institution recall to mind the new covenant, to which no one is constrained by magical means: rather, Christ awaits the response of faith operating in charity.⁴³

⁴² Manfred Hauke, ‘Shed for Many: An Accurate Rendering of *Pro Multis* in the Formula of Consecration’, *Antiphon* 14 Issue 2 (2010), p. 175

⁴³ *Ibid.* pp. 175-176

So, although all are saved, Christ has given all the freedom to accept that salvation and, consequently, since not everyone has taken up Christ's offer, only many will benefit from his pouring of his 'Blood of the new and eternal covenant' and it is a reminder for us to decide to be included.

Finally, there are two other phrases/words that need clarification: "may" in the context of the 1974 translation, 'so that sins may be forgiven' and the use of the word "for" in the current translation in the context of 'for the forgiveness of sins'. The force of the phrase "so that" carries the implication of a consequence. "So that" suggests that the Blood that will be shed as the new and everlasting covenant will be shed in order that 'sins may be forgiven'. The whole phrase, 'so that sins may be forgiven' is problematic. Firstly, the implied conditional is not in the original Latin text, '*in remissionem peccatorum*' (for the remission of sins). The Blood is being shed *for* the forgiveness of sins. Secondly, the use of "may" suggests that there is some reason to believe that the action of sins being forgiven might not happen (for example, the sin against the Holy Spirit – see Mk. 3: 28-30). In English when one uses the term "may" one has some reason to believe that it will happen but that there is a degree of uncertainty attached to its meaning. These vagaries are clarified in the current translation of the prayer through the use of the word "for" which has the meaning of, in order to or purpose of; and the force of this is that 'the forgiveness of sins' is effectively completed. Therefore, in the current translation there is no doubt what Christ said and what he intended by what he said.

The Eucharistic Prayer is an interactive prayer and there are two places where the congregation vocally responds to this Prayer: the first is at the Acclamation after the consecration and the second is with the great Amen at the end of the Eucharistic Prayer. After the consecration, the priest says 'The mystery of faith' (in the current translation),⁴⁴ and the people join the priest with one of three acclamations in response to this proclamation.

⁴⁴ In a discussion of punctuation as a distinctive expression of faith, *Ratio Translationis* on page 115 quotes the following in reference to the priest's proclamation, '*Mysterium fidei*':

In 1968 pope Paul VI decided upon the transfer of the phrase *mysterium fidei* from the words of consecration in the Roman Canon and consequently in all Eucharistic Prayers. The text of the Canon until that point offered unique punctuation surrounding the phrase:

Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testament: mysterium fidei: qui provobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.

The use of the full colons on both side of the phrase seemed to add weight to the argument made by some that it had been inserted into the biblical formula and, as a result, could be removed without harm to the Eucharistic action. Paul VI decided upon its repositioning, but without the use of an

Pope Paul VI (1974 version)

Let us proclaim the mystery of faith:

B

Dying you destroyed our death,
rising you restored our life.
Lord Jesus, come in glory.

C

When we eat this bread and drink
this cup,
we proclaim your death, Lord Jesus,
until you come in glory.

D

Lord, by your cross and resurrection
you have set us free.
You are the Saviour of the world.

Current (2010 version)

The mystery of faith.

We proclaim your Death, O Lord,
and profess your Resurrection
until you come again.

Or:

When we eat this Bread and drink
this Cup,
we proclaim your Death, O Lord,
until you come again.

Or:

Save us, Saviour of the world,
for by your Cross and Resurrection
you have set us free.

In the 1974 translation the priest announces, ‘Let us proclaim the mystery of faith’ whereas the current translation, the priest simply makes a statement: ‘The mystery of faith’. In the former, the announcement is an invitation in the form of a declaratory statement and by this announcement the priest invites all those present to make a faith statement; the current translation is closer to the intention of Pope Paul VI as noted above – drawing attention to the profundity of the mystery of salvation made present in the Eucharist. In Acclamation “B” in the 1974 translation, there are two declarations and the third statement is a plea. The first two statements are based on faith and are declarations of fact for a faith-filled person; the last statement is a prayer for the imminent second coming of Jesus. These are a logical response to the priest’s request for a proclamation of faith – they are statements of an event: that Jesus died and in doing so, he destroyed death itself; that Jesus rose from the dead and in doing so, he restored our life in God; and that we, as a post-resurrection people, anticipate his second coming in glory. What this invitation to proclaim one’s faith implies in its format is a statement of facts about the Faith.

exclamation point (i.e., *Mysterium fidei!*) which many thought would highlight its natural role as an acclamation. Instead, the Pope ruled that the phrase should be proclaimed by the Priest without amplification and without the added emphasis represented by such punctuation. As a result, the unexpected simplicity of the phrase calls attention to the profundity of the mystery which has just transpired. The *Missale Romanum* retains the phrase in typical, understated Roman style, without predicate and marked by a simple full stop:
Mysterium fidei.

In the current translation, the priest makes a statement: ‘the mystery of faith’, and this statement proclaims a fact namely, that one has to live this faith statement – hence, the response to this acclamation by all. When a person acclaims, that person lays claim to what is said; expresses approval; and extols that which is being stated. Therefore, the dynamism of this dialogue is that the celebrant makes a statement after the consecration; and the priest and people, with one voice enthusiastically proclaim firstly, the Death of Christ – with a capital “D” for the word death signifying that this death is pregnant with meaning, mystery and symbolism in that it is not like the death and rising of Lazarus but rather, this Death is salvific. Secondly, all present “profess” Christ’s Resurrection – again, the word “resurrection” has a capital “R” because it is salvific. The reference to profess is important because it carries the weight of a creedal statement; that is to say that all those present that they openly and publically declare an important tenet of one’s religious beliefs, in this case that Christ’s resurrection is salvific.⁴⁵ Finally, this acclamation has the rejoinder that this profession of faith will be proclaimed until the second coming of Christ.

In the second choice of acclamation there is not much difference in the text but there is significance in the way both are presented. In the first instance, in the current translation there is greater use of capitalisation of key words in the acclamation namely in the words “Bread”, “Cup” and “Death”. In relation to the words “Bread” and “Cup”, by using capital letters they denote that what is here present are not the bread and wine that had been brought forward earlier in the Mass but that their substances have become the Body and Blood of Christ. This is an important distinction to make at this point in the Eucharistic Prayer because it conveys a theological truth of the Faith. Furthermore, the reference to “Cup” rather than chalice may have significance, too. McKenzie has pointed out the fact that the reference to cup in the Bible often appears figuratively. He explains that “the cup of comfort” is offered to the mourner (Je 16: 7), and the cup of thanksgiving is drunk to celebrate the reception of a favour (Ps 116: 13) [and] the head of the household filled the cups of the family and guests at table; hence the cup becomes a figure of one’s lot or portion (Mt 20: 22; 26: 39).⁴⁶ So, the use of the word “cup”

⁴⁵ A close reading of the text in both Latin and English will identify that there are significant differences in reference to *resurrectionem* rendered as “Resurrection”; *calicem* rendered as “Cup”; and *crucem* rendered as “Cross”, which are in capitals in English. This is justified by appealing to *Liturgiam Authenticam* § 33 which is elaborated upon in *Ratio Translationis* §§116, 117 & 120 xi.

⁴⁶ Op. cit., *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 165

could imply not only a symbolic reference to the Blood of Christ; it could also be a reference to our sharing in the sufferings of Christ.

The reference to “O Lord”, in the current translation, where the 1974 translation simply states “Lord Jesus” is a subtle difference with the former rendition that is more in keeping with the nobility of Christ as the Eternal Son of God. “O Lord”, where ‘*Domine*’ is in the vocative case, is a prayer of supplication and assumes the divinity of Christ implicit in the title. Finally, the references to ‘until you come in glory’ in the 1974 translation and the ‘until you come again’ in the current translation also contain subtle differences. ‘Until you come again’ is both a profession of faith and a statement of fact, that is, a statement with an end-point; rather than the claim ‘until you come in glory’ which, whilst stating a fact, it is also a claim that is transitory revealing the modality of His coming.

The third acclamation in the current version of the prayer is one statement of faith. The acclamation appeals to Christ as Saviour (in his divine nature) and professes what we believe – that through Jesus’ Passion, Death and Resurrection we have been set free. The acclamation in the 1974 translation is phrased in a particular declaratory way that asserts certain central articles of faith that must be believed in order to remain Christian and these statements end with the very point of the declaration – that Jesus is Saviour. The full stop after the word “free” in the second verse of the prayer is important because it breaks up the two ideas namely: ‘by your cross and resurrection’ and ‘you are the Saviour of the world’. This has implications for dependency as the latter statement depends on the veracity of the former. This complication is avoided in the current version of the prayer not only because it is one statement but also because Christ is addressed as ‘Saviour of the world’ and the request is for Christ to save us; therefore, in his capacity as Saviour, he can, in fact, set us free.

The Roman Canon – The *Anamnesis* and *Offering*

In the *anamnesis*, the first prayer after the consecration, there is the offering.

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
Unde et memores, Domine, nos servi tui, sed et plebs tua sancta,	Father, we celebrate the memory of Christ, your Son. We, your people and your ministers,	Therefore, O Lord, as we celebrate the memorial of the blessed Passion, the Resurrection from the

eiusdem Christi,
 Filii tui, Domini
 nostri, tam
 beatae passionis,
 necnon et ab
 inferis
 resurrectionis,
 sed et in caelos
 gloriosae
 ascensionis:
 offerimus
 praeclarae
 maiestati tuae de
 tuis donis ac
 datis hostiam
 puram, hostiam
 sanctam, hostiam
 immaculatam,
 Panem sanctum
 vitae aeternae et
 Calicem salutis
 perpetuae.

recall his passion,
 his resurrection from the
 dead,
 and his ascension into
 glory;
 and from the many gifts
 you have given us
 we offer to you, God of
 glory and majesty,
 this holy and perfect
 sacrifice:
 the bread of life
 and the cup of eternal
 salvation.

dead,
 and the glorious
 Ascension into heaven
 of Christ, your Son, our
 Lord,
 we, your servants and
 your holy people,
 offer to your glorious
 majesty
 from the gifts that you
 have given us,
 this pure victim,
 this holy victim,
 this spotless victim,
 the holy Bread of eternal
 life
 and the Chalice of
 everlasting salvation.

In the 1974 translation the offering is addressed to God the Father. This offering points to what Christ offered once and for all time; and those present celebrate and participate in this offering as Jesus had commissioned. The word “*memores*” is the nominative plural of *memor*, which is an adjective that can be translated as “remembering”.⁴⁷ ‘We celebrate the “memorial” of the blessed Passion...’ as stated in the current 2010 translation, appears to be an attempt to convey the Latin “*memores*” and has a richer theological dimension to it than ‘we celebrate the memory of Christ, your Son...’ in the translation of 1974. The translators of the 2010 translation presumably believed that the English text needed a more energetic word than the literal “mindful of, remembering”. The reason for this is that in both the Judaic and Christian traditions, memorial means making present the actual salvific events themselves – the Passover and the Paschal Mystery – and ‘in the liturgical celebration of these... they become in a certain way present and real’.⁴⁸ Both Eucharistic Prayers remember the events of the Paschal Mystery and they do so with different implications. “Recall”, used in the 1974 translation, implies a bringing to the forefront of one’s mind – a remembering – that which is being celebrated. The implication of recalling is that it

⁴⁷ Op. cit., Lewis & Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, “*memor*” p. 1130

⁴⁸ CCC 1363

may not make a lasting impression – it is something that one may remember and then forget when another distraction changes one’s focus. The 2010 translation states clearly that ‘we celebrate the memorial...’ which is actually made present on the altar – the sacrifice Christ offered once for all on the cross remains ever present (see Heb. 7: 25-27).⁴⁹ By referring to the Paschal Mystery as a memorial, ‘the sacrifice of the Cross by which “Christ our Pasch has been sacrificed” is celebrated on the altar, the work of our redemption is carried out’.⁵⁰ Hence the term “recall” diminishes what one actually does celebrate; this anomaly has been rectified in the current translation with the use of the term “memorial”.

In the current translation, the prayer begins with the phrase, “therefore, O Lord”, which suggests a continuation of, and a linking with, that which had preceded it. By referring to God the Father as Lord in “O Lord”, this conveys an attitude of humility of creature before Creator. In addition, later in the prayer in its current translation, there is a reference to ‘we ... offer ... glorious majesty’ which continues this attitude of humility. Note that the Latin text of the prayer begins with “*Unde*”, which means “whence” (location) and as in English, by transference it has also the logical force of connecting ‘persons or things from which an origin, source, cause, means, reason, etc. something proceeds’.⁵¹ In English, the present continuous is used to suggest a continuous, uninterrupted action, whereas the present tense of the verb can be used to demonstrate a singular action that continues regularly for any amount of time – in this case, the Church celebrating the Mass since its institution by Christ, and through the apostles to the present day. The use of the definite article “the” in the context of the Passion/Resurrection/Ascension suggests that the events, which are central to the Paschal Mystery, are unique events – events that happened once and are never to be replicated. In the current translation the prayer continues ‘we, your servants and holy people, offer...’ with the words ‘your servants and holy people’ are set in parenthesis to emphasise who the “we” includes, which was missing from the 1974 translation of the prayer. As there is no full stop in the current version of the prayer, the prayer and thought expressed is continuous. The offering fits in with the run of the prayer because there is no comma after “majesty” so there is no break in the thought expressed and, so, it has to be assumed that what is about to be offered – Christ, the sacrificial victim for

⁴⁹ CCC 1364

⁵⁰ *ibid.*

⁵¹ *Op. cit.*, Lewis & Short, “*unde*” p. 1930

our salvation – is numbered amongst the gifts that God has given us. Included amongst these gifts are “Bread” and the “Chalice”, both in capital letters, which convey theological meaning and in accordance with the stipulations of *Ratio Translationis* must, then, be capitalized.⁵²

This *Unde et memores* prayer in the current translation, then, flows more fluently as it is a single sentence punctuated with commas that break up the longish sentence with appropriate pauses throughout. The posture of the celebrant praying and the people in silent affirmation during this prayer is one of humility as evoked in the words used. Creatures before the Creator God address him as ‘O Lord’ with the “O” being a gesture of humility where we acknowledge the greatness of God as creatures in the presence of God.

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
Supra quae propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris: et accepta habere, sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui iusti Abel, et sacrificium Patriarchae nostri Abrahae, et quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos tuus Melchisedech, sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam.	Look with favour on these offerings and accept them as once you accepted the gifts of your servant Abel, the sacrifice of Abraham, our father in faith, and the bread and wine offered by your priest Melchisedech.	Be pleased to look upon these offerings with a serene and kindly countenance, and to accept them, as once you were pleased to accept the gifts of your servant Abel the just, the sacrifice of Abraham, our father in faith, and the offering of your high priest Melchizedek, a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim.

The Eucharistic Prayer, in the current translation, continues this posture of humility with ‘Be pleased...’ through the use of the polite form of the passive voice of the verb although, this is not the form the verb takes in Latin. The literal translations of

⁵² RT §§116 & 117

selected words in the *Supra quae* prayer includes reference to the offerings over which [host and chalice] may you deign [*digneris*] to look [*respicere*] with a favourable [*propitio*] and peaceful [*sereno*] countenance. With this understanding of the translation of the prayer, the 2010 translation comes across more accurately both in meaning and intent. In this prayer we humbly ask God to accept our offering as he did with those of Abel, Abraham and Melchizedek. On the other hand, the 1974 translation begins with a command – the imperative form of the verb: “Look”. Still addressing the Father, the prayer of the priest comes across as abrupt and implies that the priest has a comparable position to God because of the way that he addresses God. This presumptuous posture has been reversed and a posture of humility has been restored in accord with the Latin text in the current translation where God is asked, ‘to look upon these offerings with a serene and kindly countenance’ – (*‘Supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris’*). The prayer is asking God to accept the offerings, which are ‘a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim’ – which is His Eternal Son, Christ our Lord. That is why we pray that God looks upon this offering with ‘a serene and kindly countenance’ – it is because we want God to see in this offering the gift of His only Begotten Son. To reinforce this prayer of offering, we ask God to deign to look upon our offerings as once He accepted the gift of His just servant, Abel, and that of Abraham, as well as that of Melchizedek. Throughout the current version, there is no presumption about expecting God to accept our offering; the implication is that He will because the sacrifice that is offered is that of His Only Begotten Son, Jesus Christ.

As he continues with the next prayer, the rubric tells the priest to pray the following prayer ‘*bowed down and with hands joined*’ which posture is of deep humility and with his hands joined makes the prayer personal yet still said for and on behalf of all. This is the second *Epiclesis* which Jungmann identifies as ‘a communion-*epiklesis*’ because this ‘third prayer after the Consecration, which makes reference to the heavenly altar, merges into a petition for a fruitful communion’.⁵³ This is borne out in the petition towards the end of this prayer: “that all of us who through this participation at the altar...may be filled with every grace and heavenly blessing” – and this includes both priest and laity.

Latin Text

**Pope Paul VI (1974
version)**

Current (2010 version)

⁵³ Op. cit., *Public Worship*, p. 135

Supplices te
rogamus,
omnipotens
Deus: iube haec
perferri per
manus sancti
Angeli tui in
sublime altare
tuum, in
conspectu
divinae
maiestatis tuae;
ut, quotquot ex
hac altaris
participatione
sacrosanctum
Filii tui Corpus et
Sanguinem
sumpserimus,
omni
benedictione
caelesti et gratia
repleamur. (Per
Christum,
Dominum
nostrum. Amen.)

Bowing, with hands joined,
he continues:

Almighty God,
we pray that your angel
may take this sacrifice
to your altar in heaven.

Then, as we receive
from this altar
the sacred body and
blood of your Son,

He stands up straight and
makes the sign of the cross,
saying:

let us be filled with
every grace and
blessing.

He joins his hands.

(Through Christ our
Lord. Amen.)

Bowing, with hands joined, he
continues:

In humble prayer we ask
you, almighty God:
command that these gifts
be borne
by the hands of your holy
Angel

to your altar on high
in the sight of your divine
majesty,

so that all of us, who
through this participation
at the altar

receive the most holy
Body and Blood of your
Son,

He stands upright again and
signs himself with the Sign of
the Cross, saying:

may be filled with every
grace and heavenly
blessing.

He joins his hands.

[Through Christ our
Lord. Amen.]

This prayer in the 1974 translation consists of two sentences, which has the effect of splitting the idea incorporated in the prayer; whilst the current version is one sentence long, which conveys the one idea more expedientially. The idea conveyed is that this sacrifice, which is accepted by God because it is an offering of His only Begotten Son, will be acceptable and, because it is acceptable, that all who receive the Body and Blood from this altar may benefit from the grace and blessing that flows from it. The colon after the word “God” in the current translation gives this prayer the impetus to convey what it intended. The colon indicates a listing,⁵⁴ which is less forceful than a full stop – which was used in the 1974 translation after the word “heaven” and in doing so, separated the point of the prayer into two segments. In the 1974 translation, the two segments are: a request for ‘your angel (to) take this sacrifice to your altar in heaven’, (“we pray that your angel may take this sacrifice to your altar in heaven”) and its consequence to receive ‘grace and blessing’. Whereas, in the 2010 translation, the request is for God to “command” (in Latin, “*iube*”) that “these gifts be borne by the

⁵⁴ Op. cit., *Oxford Guide to English Grammar*, № 56 (3 f)

hands of your holy Angel”. The use of “command” is closer to the idea of the text in Latin and supports the attitude of humility prevalent throughout the text in Latin as well as in the translation of 2010. Furthermore, by using a colon, the current translation, incorporates all that which follows stands in relation to the prayer being offered. Our prayer is for God to command that what we pray for may be achieved.

Individual words and phrases support the humility of the prayer in its current form and more closely convey what is intended in the Latin text. Beginning with “In humble prayer” the words not only suggest the attitude taken by the priest – bowed down with hands joined in an attitude of humble supplication – the words themselves state what the attitude before God is: Humility. The prayer continues by making a request of God “almighty”. By referring to ‘almighty God’ we recognise and state our distance in our relationship between one’s self and God – He is our creator and we are his creatures. In the current translation, which is supported by the Latin text, there is reference made to ‘your holy Angel’⁵⁵ – with the word “Angel”, *Angeli* with a capital “A” – whereas in 1974 the reference was to ‘your angel’ – with a lower case “a”. ‘Saint Augustine says: “Angel” is the name of their office, not of their nature’.⁵⁶ In the First Epistle of Timothy it is clear who the mediator is: ‘for there is only one God, and there is only one mediator between God and mankind, himself a man, Christ Jesus, who sacrificed himself as a ransom for them all’ (1 Tim 2: 5-6). So, the current translation, following the Latin text ‘*iube hæc perferri per manus sancti Angeli tui in sublime altare tuum*’ clarifies that Christ the high priest himself is making this offering. According to the Book of Hebrews: ‘so Christ, too, only offers himself once...’ (Heb 9: 28); what we do at Mass is offer ourselves and our offering to God united with Christ’s offering.

The prayer continues with an air of supplication to ‘your divine majesty’, which reiterates the stance taken at the beginning of the prayer and is maintained throughout. One can obtain what one needs from the use of *supplices* as the subject of the main verb *rogamus*. The purpose of this supplication is clarified with the rejoinder ‘may be filled with every grace and heavenly blessing’. The direct approach to God, in the 1974 translation, has been softened in the current translation by indicating in the rubrics as well as in the words used throughout the prayer that this prayer is offered to God in deep humility. This stance before God is supported by the Book of Exodus, ‘And

⁵⁵ RT § 117

⁵⁶ CCC 329

Moses bowed down to the ground at once and worshipped (YHWH)' (Ex 34: 8) as well as the prophet Ezekiel who had a vision of God 'it was something that looked like the glory of YHWH. I looked, and prostrated myself, and I heard a voice speaking' (Ez. 1: 28). Through this prayer we are in the presence of God, speaking to God and both the stance of the priest as well as the words used by the priest conveys an attitude of humility that is supported by Moses and Ezekiel.

The Roman Canon – *Intercessions*

The next prayer is for the commemoration of the dead. This second set of petitions, according to Jungmann, 'is a desire to intercede for the dead (and) they could not... be included in the former petitions with the living, since they do not rank with them as offerers of the sacrifice'.⁵⁷ So, they are included here because they 'have gone before us with the sign of faith' that is, through their Baptism, and it is appropriate to pray for them. The current translation includes these people at the beginning of the prayer; the 1974 translation ends with special petitions for those whom we wish to call to mind. This reversal in order is significant because in the former translation, there was a general petition for those that had died and then for particular persons mentioned whereas the current translation personalises this petition.

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
Memento etiam, Domine, famulorum famularumque tuarum N. et N. , qui nos praecesserunt cum signo fidei, et dormiunt in somno pacis.	Remember, Lord, those who have died and have gone before us marked with the sign of faith, especially those for whom we now pray, N. and N.	Remember also, Lord, your servants N. and N. , who have gone before us with the sign of faith and rest in the sleep of peace.
Ipsis, Domine, et omnibus in Christo quiescentibus, locum refrigerii, lucis et pacis, ut indulgeas, deprecamur.	May these, and all who sleep in Christ, find in your presence light, happiness, and peace. (Through Christ our Lord. Amen.)	Grant them, O Lord, we pray, and all who sleep in Christ, a place of refreshment, light and peace. [Through Christ our Lord. Amen.]

⁵⁷ Op. cit., *Public Worship*, p. 136

(Per Christum,
Dominum
nostrum. Amen.)

The force of “also” in the current translation has the capacity of keeping the momentum of the prayer moving forward. “Also” reiterates what had been prayed for earlier – in reference to remembering one’s living relatives and friends as well as those gathered here at Mass. The current translation does not include ‘those who have died’ as in the 1974 translation, which is significant because the word “died” was meant to convey those that had physically passed away; it might also have had a theological interpretation of being dead – as in sin – which would mean that one was praying for a person who was so bound up in sin at death that that person was spiritually dead. Although the next line does say, ‘and have gone before us marked with the sign of faith’, this may be interpreted as a reference to one’s Baptism and would not necessarily negate the idea that a person might be spiritually dead. So, if this word were mistakenly interpreted in this way then the current version has avoided this ambiguity by not referring to those who had died; but rather, referred to those people as resting ‘in the sleep of peace’, which translation from the Latin is: *‘dormiunt in somno pacis’*.

The imperative of the verb “grant” in the prayer ‘grant them’ has been softened by the plea ‘O Lord, we pray’ in the current translation so that the prayer does not come across as a command (grant) but rather as a petition prayed with confidence. Included in the 1974 translation was a new phrase and a new word introduced that was not part of the Latin text. The Latin text *‘ipsis, Domine, et omnibus in Christo quiescentibus, locum refrigerii, lucis et pacis, ut indulgeas, deprecamur’* where the phrase ‘find in your presence’ is not indicated by the Latin text. The current version of the prayer translates the phrase *‘locum refrigerii, lucis et pacis, ut indulgeas, deprecamur’* as ‘a (*locum*) place of refreshment, light and peace’. This translation is closer to the original Latin text and it also avoids adding a phrase that was not there. In a similar way, because the word “refreshment” was the literal translation of *‘refrigerii’* (cooling), something was lost in dropping this word in the English translation in 1974 and replacing it with “happiness”. Happiness might be implied in becoming refreshed; this refreshment, however, is a quality that one attains in and through sleeping in Christ. It is refreshment that is completed in Christ.

The commemoration of the dead continues with a prayer of intercession with another list of saints.

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
<p>Nobis quoque peccatoribus famulis tuis, de multitudine miserationum tuarum sperantibus, partem aliquam et societatem donare digneris cum tuis sanctis Apostolis et Martyribus: cum Ioanne, Stephano, Matthia, Barnaba, (Ignatio, Alexandro, Marcellino, Petro, Felicitate, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucia, Agnete, Caecilia, Anastasia) et omnibus Sanctis tuis: intra quorum nos consortium, non aestimator meriti, sed veniae, quaesumus, largitor admitte. Per Christum, Dominum nostrum.</p>	<p>For ourselves, too, we ask some share in the fellowship of your apostles and martyrs, with John the Baptist, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, (Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicity, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecilia, Anastasia) and all the saints.</p> <p>The priest strikes his breast with the right hand, saying:</p> <p>Though we are sinners, we trust in your mercy and love.</p> <p>With hands extended as before, he continues:</p> <p>Do not consider what we truly deserve, but grant us your forgiveness.</p> <p>He joins his hands.</p> <p>Through Christ our Lord.</p>	<p>He strikes his breast with his right hand, saying:</p> <p>To us, also, your servants, who, though sinners, And, with hands extended, he continues:</p> <p>hope in your abundant mercies, graciously grant some share and fellowship with your holy Apostles and Martyrs: with John the Baptist, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, [Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicity, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecilia, Anastasia] and all your Saints; admit us, we beseech you, into their company, not weighing our merits, but granting us your pardon, He joins his hands. through Christ our Lord.</p>

The way that punctuation is used throughout both prayers has a bearing on the flow of each prayer as well as the content within the prayer conveyed. The 1974 translation of the prayer has four sentences with four ideas – the idea of praying for ourselves; being sinners we trust in God’s mercy and love; prayer for forgiveness; and this prayer is made through the intercession of Christ. The current version of the prayer

has all these ideas incorporated into one sentence which has been punctuated with commas in the usual places but also with a colon after the word ‘Apostles and Martyrs’ denoting a listing of those people will follow, and the use of a semi-colon after the word “Saints” indicating a discontinuity of a grammatical construction which is greater than that indicated by a comma but less than that indicated by a full stop. In other words, the train of thought, begun in a posture of humility is carried through in the same posture of humility by praying through the intercession of Christ our Lord.

Complementing this posture of humility the current version of the prayer employs other words and phrases that convey this. As noted above, the reference to “your servants” is an acknowledgement of our status before God and places this relationship on an appropriate plane; the reference to ‘hope in your abundant mercies’ is a plea to God to grant us his mercy; as well as the word “graciously” which conveys the idea of by your (God’s) grace and implies that the action is wholly dependent on God and allows God the freedom and choice to be disposed to show or dispense grace – that is, that share in the fellowship of saints named. The words, “admit us” continues the profile of humility begun with the word “graciously” because it continues with the ‘we beseech you’ which is a plea uttered in humility to grant us the intercession for which we prayed – to be admitted into the company of the saints named. ‘Do not consider what we truly deserve’ is the content of the prayer for forgiveness uttered in the 1974 translation of the prayer.

The 2010 translation of the phrase, ‘not weighing our merits, but granting us your pardon’ is a succinct rendering of what the translation of the 1974 prayer states. Indeed, the 1974 translation of the prayer, the faith of the Church is evident in the humble prayer of acknowledgement in, ‘Though we are sinners, we trust in your mercy and love’ because these words bring to mind the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector (Lk. 18: 9-14). In this parable, the humility of the tax collector in his prayer before God brings about his justification. The words, ‘do not consider what we truly deserve’ (1974 translation) are implicit in the tax collector’s prayer, ‘be merciful to me a sinner’ as are the words, ‘but grant us your forgiveness’. It should be noted in the parable that the pride of the Pharisee did not lead to his justification. The important truth contained in the parable is that humble sorrow for sin before God is a definitive part of obtaining pardon and forgiveness. It is worthwhile noting here that the word *venia* can be translated as “forgiveness” as in 1974 and it can also be translated as

“pardon” as in the 2010 translation.⁵⁸ So, although the differences are in the English translations, the translation of this prayer of 2010 summarised what the prayer of 1974 stated as well it follows more closely what the text in Latin is conveying.⁵⁹

Finally, the prayer opens with the ‘to us’ in the current translation and with ‘for ourselves’ in the 1974 translation. ‘For ourselves’ where ‘ourselves’ is a personal pronoun and refers to our particular group of people; the use of “us” as an object pronoun in the plural refers to the speakers and the congregation themselves. Although the two introductions convey the same idea, it is just that the current translation is more closely aligned to the Latin text than was the 1974 translation. The Latin text reads ‘*Nobis quoque peccatoribus famulis tuis*’ and literally translates as ‘to us sinners also your servants’ and where the pronoun “us” in the current translation is the direct object of the verb “grant”. Following this the use of the words “of” in 1974 and the word “with” currently, has subtle implications in meaning. The use of “with” denotes a personal relationship between the two sets of people named, that is, ‘us...your servants’ and the ‘holy Apostles and Martyrs’. In English “with” is used when making a comparison between the situations of different people. In the 1974 translation, the use of the term “of” denotes a connecting of two nouns of which the former denotes the class of which the latter is a particular example – in this case, us, the congregation, and the apostles and martyrs. The use of the term “with” has a sense of fellowship to it where the term “of” seems to categorise or classify people in terms of some objective quality.

The Roman Canon – The *Final Doxology*

This brings the Eucharistic Prayer to its penultimate prayer:

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
Per quem haec omnia, Domine, semper bona creas, sanctificas, vivificas, benedixis, et praestas nobis.	Through him you give us all these gifts. You fill them with life and goodness, you bless them and make them holy.	Through whom you continue to make all these good things, O Lord; you sanctify them, fill them with life, bless them, and bestow them upon us.

⁵⁸ Op. cit., Lewis and Short, “s.v. *venia*” p. 1968

⁵⁹ See references to RT §§111 & 113

The references to ‘through him’ in the 1974 translation and ‘through whom’ in the current translation refer to Christ our Lord, through whom the intercessory prayer of the last prayer was offered. So, the use of the word “through” has the effect of giving continuity to the Eucharistic Prayer. The use of “whom” in the current translation has a more seamless flow to the continuation of the prayer than does ‘through him’ because the use of the latter has the sense of beginning a new idea; the use of “whom” has the effect of relating back to the person addressed previously, namely, Christ our Lord. Yet again, for the sake of the constraints of the rules of English syntax, there are two sentences conveying two ideas – the gifts given to us through Christ and that these gifts are unique filled with life and goodness, and are made holy. On the other hand, these ideas are conveyed through one sentence in the current translation – thereby unifying the content of this prayer. The difference in the terminology of ‘you give us...gifts’, in 1974, and ‘you continue to make (create)...good things’ in the current translation is in the action of the verbs used. In the former the verb, “give”, has the sense of a donation; whereas, in the latter, the use of the verb, “make”, suggests that good things are made present to and for us and implies the idea of giving. The word “make” recalls the eternally creative act of the Father to whom, after all, this Eucharistic Prayer is addressed – “you” in this case is a prayer addressed to the Father. In addition, the use of the phrase ‘you sanctify them’, ‘*sanctificas*’, is in the Latin text and is missing from the 1974 translation of the prayer – which oversight is important when referring to the actual gifts that God has provided: the Body and Blood of Christ. Finally, the current translation of the prayer uses the word “bestow” which suggests that God confers as a gift that for which we pray. This is an apt word in the circumstances as; ultimately, all is gift from God including the graces that flow from accepting these gifts of God.

The final prayer is the concluding doxology ending with the great “Amen”:

Latin Text	Pope Paul VI (1974 version)	Current (2010 version)
Per ipsum, et cum ipso, et in ipso, est tibi Deo Patri omnipotenti, in unitate Spiritus Sancti, omnis honor et gloria per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen.	Through him, with him, in him, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all glory and honour is yours, almighty Father, for ever and ever.	Through him, and with him, and in him, O God, almighty Father, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all glory and honour is yours, for ever and ever. The people acclaim: Amen.

The people respond:

Amen.

In this prayer there are only two instances where there is a variation in the texts. In the first, there is the use of the conjunction “and” – ‘through him, and with him, and...’ in the current version which is missing in the 1974 translation of the prayer. The current translation emphasises the point being made whereas the 1974 translation probably, in order to streamline the information conveyed, has separated the introduction of the proclamation with commas. The second change is that God the Father, who is and has been addressed throughout the Eucharistic Prayer is introduced at this point of the prayer in the current translation of the prayer whereas in the 1974 translation, God is mentioned towards the end. This may have been for effect – that is, to raise the prayer to that point, however, this does not do justice to the Latin text. The Latin text states: ‘*Per ipsum, et cum ipso, et in ipso, est tibi Deo Patri omnipotenti, in unitate Spiritus Sancti, omnis honor et gloria per omnia saecula saeculorum*’ and the positioning of ‘*est tibi Deo Patri omnipotenti*’ in relation to the Holy Spirit clearly indicates that the introduction of the prayer concerning Christ is made to the Father ‘*in unitate Spiritus Sancti*’ in the unity of the Holy Spirit. Then, the people voice their approval at the end of this prayer with the great “Amen”. Now, in the current translation of the prayer the rubrics say that the people “acclaim”⁶⁰ which is more forceful than the instructions in the rubrics in the 1974 translation, which states that the people “respond”. The word “acclaim” means to shout and express approval of something – in this case, the agreement of the people for what has been expressed in this Eucharistic Prayer. The instruction in 1974, “respond”, implies answer or gives a reply to something or someone – in this case, the priest. There is no suggestion that there is much force or enthusiasm in the response “Amen”. Indeed, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* refers to Christ as the “Amen”: of the definitive love of the Father for us; he takes up and completes our “Amen” to the Father; and for ‘all the promises of God find their Yes in him (Christ)’.⁶¹ The people’s response implies a union with Christ as well as an affirmation with all that has been stated throughout the Eucharistic Prayer.

The approach taken in this chapter has been to critique the current translation of the First Eucharistic Prayer. This included a discussion and analysis of the role of

⁶⁰ In the *Missale Romanum Editio Typica Tertia*, before the ‘Great Amen’, the rubrics in Latin state, ‘*Populus acclamat*’, which translates into ‘the people acclaim’ (see Appendix E).

⁶¹ CCC 1065

punctuation in the theological understanding of the content of the prayers of the First Eucharistic Prayer. It also included an analysis in the way that punctuation was employed and, in turn how this had a bearing on the meaning conveyed in a prayer. Secondly, language and grammar were critiqued for the significance and influence they had on the theological interpretation and understanding of God and of the relationship of God and mankind in this Prayer. Thirdly, the discussion in this chapter demonstrated how the linguistic structure of the First Eucharistic Prayer influenced our understanding of the relationship of mankind and God.

CHAPTER 3

An Understanding of God as conveyed in the Roman Canon

Introduction

As noted in the previous chapter, the people's response to the great Prayer of Thanksgiving is "Amen". To what is it that we are saying "Amen"? It is an affirmation of and gratitude to God who promised and delivered our salvation and this chapter will examine an understanding of God inherent in the first Eucharistic Prayer. Through liturgy, and particularly in this case, the Roman Canon, we become rightly ordered in our relationship with God. By making God our focus, our priorities in life take their appropriate place in the order of things: God and our duty of service to others, and away from self-interest.

God always is; how we as a People of God have understood God has been influenced not only by language as discussed in the previous chapter, but also by our time and the cultural expression of God in that society. According to Monsignor Harbert, the translators of the Roman Missal in the 1960s were influenced by Noam Chomsky as well as by Eugene Nida. Chomsky's influence was in the 'patterns of deep structure', which 'was understood to be composed of simple elements or kernels, the basic building blocks of language'.¹ The application of this theory led translators to change ideas and information in the passive voice into the active voice because 'the active voice in language is more basic than the passive'.² This became a pattern of the 1974 translation of the Roman Canon as was noted in my previous chapter and which had consequences in conveying the message that what we believe is what we pray: recalling *lex orandi...lex credendi*. However, as noted in Chapter 1 of this thesis, underpinning accurate and authentic translation is the understanding that translations should convey the meaning of the liturgical language.

The language of the Liturgy has a sacred character which sets it apart, since through it the whole Church, as the Body of Christ, joins with one voice in praise of the Father. Moreover, liturgical language is often drawn directly from the Scriptures so that when the Church prays she is united to Christ the Word in his own prayer to the

¹ Bruce E. Harbert, 'The Roman Rite and the English Translation', *Antiphon*, Vol. 9. Issue 1, 2005, p. 17

² *Ibid.*, p. 18

Father...The Church's response to this Word echoes the "Amen" that Christ, the Mediator between God and man, uttered once and for all as he shed his blood to seal the everlasting covenant in the Holy Spirit (2 Cor 1:20-22).³

To this end, where the whole Church prays with one voice, the voice of Christ, the language of the liturgy of necessity should be different from everyday language. Liturgical language is elevated language and incorporates the voices of the Church both in heaven and on earth. Hence, 'familiarity with the sources of prayers from the *Missale Romanum* is of fundamental importance in accurate translation, since the meaning of such source texts in their original contexts is often blended into the final form of a collect, Preface, antiphon, canticle or blessing'.⁴ This point is important for this chapter where it will be argued that an accurate translation of the prayers, in particular selected Prefaces, the idea of *lex orandi...lex credendi* - that is, the idea that prayers express belief – can be more forcefully conveyed.

Images of God, as conveyed through a study of selected Prefaces initially and then a more detailed comparative study and analysis of the image of God in specific Prefaces with their associated *Communicantes* prayers will be undertaken. Thus, 'according to the formula "*lex orandi, lex credendi*", the Church's liturgical rite will always be a reflection of her faith'⁵ and if it is restricted to a current view and interpretation of who God is by some at a particular point in history, then the Eucharistic Prayer will primarily lose its universal nature and aspect as the Prayer of Thanksgiving for and by the whole Church. The 2010 translation of the Roman Missal from Latin into English and approved by Pope Benedict XVI restores the balance between the faithful's perception of God and their rightful relationship with Him. This Chapter, then, will examine the understanding of God as portrayed through selected Prefaces and prayers of the Roman Canon.

The whole Eucharistic Prayer is a prayer of thanksgiving and both translations, of 1974 and of 2010, will theologically be examined in detail for their insights of God. The Eucharistic Prayer beginning with the Preface is a prayer in which the priest in the person of Christ the High Priest thanks God the Father for what He has done through His Son Jesus Christ with the gift of the Holy Spirit. So, beginning with an overview of eight selected Prefaces – including two from Advent, three from Ordinary Time and

³ CDWDS, *Ratio Translationis*, §1 (Hereafter RT)

⁴ RT §8

⁵ Marc Aillet, *The Old Mass and the New*, p. 40

another three from Lent (including one from Passiontide) – these Prefaces will be critiqued within themselves in terms of how they, as a whole, summarise the history of salvation and through this the image of God they contain. The relevant texts from the translation of 2010 will be cited throughout this chapter. Following this there will be a detailed examination and critique of the Prefaces and their proper “*Communicantes*” for such major feasts and solemnities as: ‘the Nativity of the Lord’, from the ‘Feast of the Epiphany’, for Holy Thursday, and from the ‘Mass of the Paschal Vigil until the Second Sunday of Easter’; and “*Hanc Igitur*” prayers from the ‘Mass of the Paschal Vigil until the Second Sunday of Easter’. In this case the information conveyed by the 1974 and 2010 translations will be compared, contrasted and critiqued for the image of God conveyed in these prayers. ‘In the course of a year, the Church unfolds the whole mystery of Christ from the Incarnation and Nativity to the ascension, to Pentecost, and the expectation of blessed hope coming of the Lord’⁶ and the collection of Prefaces reflect these aspects of the history of God’s salvation and, again through this the image of God conveyed. In order to understand the idea of God conveyed in the Prefaces and prayers nominated, one needs to understand that the whole calendar of the Church’s year is a celebration of and a reflection upon the mystery of salvation.

Prefaces of Advent

Beginning the Church’s year, the season of Advent has a twofold character: it is a time to prepare for Christmas when one remembers the first coming of Christ; and secondly, Advent anticipates and calls on the faithful to prepare for the second coming of Christ. Advent, then, ‘is a period of devout and joyful expectation’.⁷ The First Preface of Advent anticipates the birth of Christ with ‘he assumed at his first coming the lowliness of human flesh’ which is echoed in the humility of Christ in Saint Paul’s Letter to the Philippians, ‘who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men’ (Phil. 2: 6-7) which he did so that all might be saved through his Passion, Death and Resurrection. ‘What god is great like our God’ (Ps. 77: 13) the psalmist confidently proclaims yet, God in the person of the eternal Son of God humbled Himself by becoming man! Not only is the paschal mystery here

⁶ Second Vatican Council. The Constitution on the Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, (4 December 1963), §102 (Hereafter SC)

⁷ See General Norms for the Liturgical Year and Calendar, §39 (Hereafter GNLYC)

indicated; his Incarnation is stated in the phrase ‘he assumed...the lowliness of human flesh’, which is the focus of Advent – that is, the upcoming birth of Jesus Christ. The Preface continues with, ‘and so fulfilled the design you formed long ago’, that is, in fulfilment of the promise of salvation made in the Book of Genesis: ‘I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; he shall bruise your head, and you will bruise his heel’ (Gn. 3: 15) indicating in this way God’s deep love and concern for His creation. Through disobedience and sin, man had turned away from God, acted selfishly and, as a consequence, lost that special relationship that he had with God. By promising a saviour, God ‘opened for us the way to eternal salvation’. In His goodness and generosity, God did not just make a promise; He acted on that promise by sending people like Abraham and Moses as well as the prophets. Again and again God encouraged His Chosen People to obey his commands; again and again He was rejected by them (see Jer. 7: 23-28). Nevertheless, God persevered so that in due time He sent us His only Son Jesus Christ.

However, the importance of the Incarnation and of the paschal mystery did not stop at that moment in time rather it ‘opened for us the way to eternal salvation’ as Saint Paul rightly noted ‘therefore just as one man’s trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one man’s act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all. For as by the one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by one man’s obedience many will be made righteous’ (Rom. 5: 18-19). God had promised redemption and the prayer of the Preface reiterates that fact. And the first Preface for Advent continues with a reference to the second coming of Christ: ‘that, when he comes in glory and majesty...’ thereby binding the first and second comings of Christ. What the faithful are praying for with Christ’s second coming is that ‘(we) may inherit the great promise in which now we dare to hope’; which, in the meantime, means that the Church’s attitude before God is “watching” and “waiting” “for that day” – and in this way fulfil the hope of Advent for the faithful, today. In this first Preface, then, both themes of Advent are eloquently combined and the mystery of salvation proclaimed.

In the Second Advent Preface, the Advent theme is continued with the emphasis on the birth of Christ. Salvation history is recalled with a reference that ‘all the oracles of the prophets foretold him’ thereby acknowledging the goodness and mercy of God. God, through the prophet Micah (Mic. 5: 2) foretold that the Messiah would be born in Bethlehem; this was confirmed in Matthew 2: 1 and in Luke 2: 4-6. Furthermore, Isaiah (Is. 7: 14) foretold that the Messiah would be born of a virgin; this was

confirmed by Matthew 1: 22-23 and by Luke 1: 26-31. And, the Messiah would be heir to the throne of David (2 Samuel 7: 12-13 and Isaiah 9: 7) which was fulfilled in Luke 1: 32-33 and in Romans 1: 3. Gradually over time God lifted the veil of the mystery of the Incarnation and the paschal mystery that He had announced in the Book of Genesis – ‘I will put enmity between you and the woman, between your seed and her seed’ (Gn. 3: 15).

John the Baptist announced Christ’s presence as the Preface states when he ‘sang of his coming and proclaimed his presence when he came’. In the Gospel of Luke, John the Baptist acknowledged the presence of God in the person of Jesus at the moment ‘when Elizabeth heard the greeting of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb... for behold, when the voice of your greeting came to my ears, the babe in my womb leaped for joy’ (Lk 1: 41&44). The verse of the Preface acclaims that even before he was born John the Baptist reacted and without a voice he was able to ‘sing of his coming’ with joy. Then, at the time appointed by God, John the Baptist announced his coming and Jesus began his public ministry. All four gospels testify to this: John the Baptist, calling to mind the prophecy of Isaiah, ‘He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; like a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and like a sheep that before its shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth’ (Is. 53: 7) states, ‘Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world’ (Jn. 1: 29). The three synoptic gospels reiterate the theme of repentance, a key feature of John the Baptist’s message in preparation for the coming of the messiah (see Mt. 3: 1-3; Mk. 1: 1-3; and Lk. 3: 1-6). The prayerful response of the faithful in the Preface is: ‘It is by his gift that already we rejoice at the mystery of his Nativity, so that he may find us watchful in prayer and exultant in his praise’. The gift referred to is the gift of salvation offered by God and anticipated in the birth of His Son – for which the season of Advent is a time for preparation. As a prelude for the Nativity of the Lord and in response to the goodness and generosity of God, this season and the Preface is a time of joyful watching and waiting for the coming of the saviour at Christmas.

The Season of Christmas celebrates the birth of the saviour of the world, Christ our Lord. ‘Next to the yearly celebration of the paschal mystery, the Church holds most sacred the memorial of Christ’s birth and early manifestations’.⁸ The Prefaces for the Nativity of the Lord; of the Epiphany; of Easter; will be critiqued and analysed later in

⁸ See GNLYC §32

this chapter when the ‘*Communicantes*’ and the ‘*Hanc igitur*’ prayers will be discussed in relation to these prayers of the Preface.

Prefaces in Ordinary Time

Next in the Church’s annual cycle is “Ordinary Time”⁹ which is a season devoted to celebrating the mystery of Christ in all its aspects.¹⁰ This season is interrupted with the seasons of Lent and of Easter and, so, it is in two parts. There are eight Prefaces for this season and all highlight a deed of Christ – for the purposes of this thesis, the focus of analysis will be on three of them (beginning with Preface IV, then followed by Prefaces I and VIII) to illustrate some of these deeds. The Prefaces will be discussed in the order of Preface IV, first because it stipulates Christ’s birth as part of the Paschal Mystery; the first Preface focuses on Paschal Mystery itself and its consequences for mankind; and the eighth Preface has a focus on the Holy Spirit in the Paschal Mystery.

The first of the Prefaces to be discussed is Preface IV, which focuses on Christ’s deed of opening up the mystery of salvation. At the heart of the prayer, the Church prays

For by his birth he brought renewal
to humanity’s fallen state,
and by his suffering, cancelled out our sins;
by his rising from the dead he has opened the way to eternal life,
and by ascending to you, O Father,
he has unlocked the gates of heaven.

This prayer can be divided into four Mysteries: Christ’s birth; his suffering and death for the salvation of all; his resurrection for the redemption of all; and his ascension. Christ’s birth was the beginning of the hope promised by God with the Fall of Adam and Eve. As Scripture states, at the appointed time ‘God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons’ (Gal. 4: 4-5). The fact of the Incarnation, in the words of John the evangelist, was that ‘the Word became flesh and dwelt among us’ (Jn. 1: 14) and the purpose of this Incarnation was, solely, the redemption of mankind.

In order to prove further the great love of God for his creation notwithstanding mankind’s fall from grace can be ascertained when ‘as sin came into the world through

⁹ The Latin for this time in the Church’s year is “*per annum*”, which simply means “through the year”.

¹⁰ *The Celebration of Eucharist and the Liturgy of the Hours* for the Dioceses of Australia and New Zealand following the General Roman Calendar (*Ordo* 2014), p. 95

one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned' (Rom. 5: 12) and 'the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord' (Rom. 6: 23) – in other words, God offered redemption. When Adam sinned and separated himself from God, God's holiness demanded punishment and atonement for this sin 'but God proves his love for us in that while we were sinners Christ died for us' [Rom. 5: 8] and the punishment and atonement for sin was borne by Christ - the Word of God – the eternal Son of God. The Preface continues with 'by his rising from the dead he has opened the way to eternal life' because as the Letter to the Romans confirms, 'the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord' (Rom. 6: 23). According to Saint Paul, 'as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive' (1 Cor. 15: 21-22). It was fitting that Christ suffered and died because God's holiness and justice demand that sin be punished and the punishment for sin is eternal damnation. 'But God, who is rich in mercy, out of the great love with which he loved us, even when we were dead through our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ – by grace you have been saved – and raised us up with him, and made us sit with him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus' (Eph. 2: 4-6). Hence, through his ascension, that which had been lost through the sin of Adam, namely the possibility of a close and personal relationship with God, has been restored ultimately by Christ's ascension made possible through his birth as a man, and through his Passion, Death and Resurrection.

The details of Christ's salvific act are spelt out more clearly in the First Preface in Ordinary Time in which the fruits of the Paschal Mystery are highlighted. In this Preface we pray

For through his Paschal Mystery,
he accomplished the marvellous deed,
by which he has freed us from the yoke of sin and death,
summoning us to the glory of being now called
a chosen race, a royal priesthood,
a holy nation, a people for your own possession,
to proclaim everywhere your mighty works,
for you have called us out of darkness
into your own wonderful light.

In the first instance it should be noted that it is 'his Paschal Mystery' meaning that Christ suffered, died, rose from death and ascended to God his Father as part of a plan by God for the salvation of all. Christ said, 'No one takes it (my life) from me, but I lay it down of my own accord. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up

again: this charge I have received from my Father' (Jn. 10: 18). From this it is clear that Christ was in control of his destiny and that the players in orchestrating his execution were necessary participants in God's plan for salvation. This is borne out by Jesus' prayer for his executioners: 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do' (Lk 23: 34) where Jesus personifies the mercy of God. In fact, Christ's death and resurrection were prophesied: 'And I will pour out on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem a spirit of compassion and supplication, so that, when they look on him whom they have pierced, they shall mourn for him' (Zech 12: 10) and in another place Christ likened his death and resurrection to the "sign of Jonah" for 'as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so will the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth' (Mt 12: 40). These are confirmed in the gospels, 'thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead' (Lk 24: 46). This act of redemption is, indeed, in the words of the Preface, a "marvellous deed".

The consequence of this act of redemption is the focus of the next part of the prayer 'by which he has freed us from the yoke of sin and death'. Being redeemed, the Christian can, with confidence, approach God through the mediation of Jesus for in him 'we have a great high priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God' (Heb. 4: 14). We, the faithful are encouraged to 'hold fast our confession' (Heb. 4: 14) meaning that we should practise what we believe, that is, that Jesus is our saviour and subsequently we can be what we are "called" to be namely 'a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for your own possession' (see 1 Peter 2: 9). As Jesus had said, 'think not that I have come to abolish the law or the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfil them' (Mt. 5: 17). In the light of this, this has implications on who Christians are for they have become the new 'chosen race'; through Baptism; Christians have become a 'royal priesthood' assuming their priestly function, gratuitously given in the sacrament of Baptism and worshipping God through Jesus their Universal King in the Kingdom of God; and, as members of that Kingdom, they are members of a 'holy nation' and as such as sons and daughters of God through Christ we become 'a people for your own possession'. Finding ourselves in this close relationship with God we have the opportunity 'to proclaim everywhere' the 'mighty works' of God, because we have been called out of the darkness that was sin 'into your own wonderful light' which is God.

In the last of the Prefaces to be discussed (Ordinary Time VIII) the focus is on the consequence of Christ's act of redemption, which is communion with God. God's kindness and generosity are manifestly present in this prayer:

For when your children were scattered afar by sin,
through the Blood of your Son and the power of the Spirit,
you gathered them again to yourself,
that a people, formed as one by the unity of the Trinity,
made the body of Christ and the temple of the Holy Spirit,
might, to the praise of your manifold wisdom,
be manifest as the Church.

As has been noted, the consequence of sin is death, including the death of eternal life with God. Another consequence of sin is the alienation and separation of mankind within itself and with his environment, which is recalled in the Preface 'when your children were scattered afar by sin'. The Book of Genesis details the gradual worsening of the effects of sin with the sin of disobedience committed by Adam and Eve; the sin of fratricide committed by Cain on Abel; and 'The LORD saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually' (Gn. 6:5) and, further, in relation to their environment, God said to Adam, 'cursed is the ground because of you; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life' (Gn. 3: 17b).

This theme of alienation continued through the Flood with Noah being the focus of a new creation to the dispersion of the peoples through the incidence of the Tower of Babel where the people rebelled against God citing their abandonment of Him – 'let us make a name for ourselves' (Gn. 11: 4). This dispersion of races and peoples has been reconciled in and through Christ for, just as the consequence of the sin at Babel was the advent of different languages so that people found it difficult to communicate; the effects of the sending of the Paraclete at Pentecost was that the message of salvation was heard and understood by all:

And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance ... and they (the crowd) were amazed and wondered, saying, 'Are not all these who are speaking Galileans? And how is it that we hear, each of us in his own language' (Acts 2: 4, 7-8).

This had been made possible only by the Death, Resurrection and Ascension of Christ for he had promised to send an Advocate 'I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Counsellor, to be with you for ever' (Jn. 14: 16). Thus we can pray with confidence in the Preface that 'you gathered them again to yourself through the Blood

of your Son and the power of the Spirit'. Through the Paschal mystery and the Pentecostal experience of the Church, that which sin had destroyed in the relationship of God and mankind Christ had made whole again.

Therefore, what we profess in the Nicene Creed – one God, Father, Son, Holy Spirit – is made manifest in the communion that we share with the Trinity. In the same way that the Mystical Body of Christ consists of Christ as head and the faithful as the Body – the Church – so, too, are we united in communion with the Trinity because Christ, the Word of God, is, at the same time, the eternal Son of God and through Him the Church shares in the communion of the Trinity. What we are praying in the Preface when we say, 'that a people made the body of Christ and the temple of the Holy Spirit' is that through the Paschal Mystery that the Church, the Body of Christ, is 'made one by the unity of the Trinity' and as the Body of Christ we are 'made...the temple of the Holy Spirit'. Saint Paul confirms this transformation in us when he says, 'do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God? You are not your own' (1 Cor. 6: 19).

The consequence of this is that we 'might (make this) manifest as the Church' meaning that in our lives, individually, we acknowledge a responsibility to live this reality. In accepting that this communion, which this Preface highlights, is a reality brought about by the gratuitous love of God through Christ for one reason only, namely 'to the praise of your wonderful wisdom' we sing our hymn of praise in the Sanctus: 'Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God'. Throughout the discussion on the Prefaces in Ordinary Time then, it has become clear that because we had sinned, we deserved God's eternal damnation; however, because of the love that God has for His creation we acknowledge in the Preface that it is through the wisdom of God, that is unfathomable – 'we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Gentiles' (1 Cor. 1: 23) – that God has redeemed us.

Prefaces of Lent

The next sets of Prefaces to be examined are the ones for Lent and Passiontide. Lent is a time for prayer, penance and almsgiving; and is an opportunity for each person, individually and the Church as community, to prepare for Easter. These numerous Prefaces reflect the need for repentance. The Prefaces that will be examined include Prefaces for Lent II and VIII – chosen for their particular focus on Christ's suffering; as well as the Preface of the Passion of the Lord I.

In the first of these Prefaces, the Church prays:

For you have given your children a sacred time
for the renewing and purifying of their hearts,
that, freed from disordered affections,
they may deal with things of this passing world
as to hold rather to the things that eternally endure.

And as has been noted earlier, God calls all to enter into communion with him and this requires conversion to doing things God's way, to repentance – to an interior change – in other words, to turn away from evil and turn towards what is good at the deepest level. As the prophet Ezekiel stated:

Therefore I will judge you, O house of Israel, every one according to his ways, says the Lord GOD. Repent and turn away from all your transgressions, lest iniquity be your ruin. Cast away from you all the transgressions which you have committed against me, and get yourselves a new heart and a new spirit (Ezek. 18: 30-31).

This Preface, inspired perhaps by Ezekiel, singles out this need for a change in behaviour in the phrase 'freed from disordered affections' in that anything that is contrary to the eternal Law sets one apart from God. 'Sin is ... an offence against God in disobedience to his love; it wounds human nature and injures human solidarity.'¹¹ Isaiah said, 'wash yourselves; make yourselves clean; remove the evil of your doings from before my eyes; cease to do evil' (Is. 1: 16). Lent, then is a time to focus on those areas in one's life that are disordered and in need of change.

The heart of the prayer of this Preface is that God has given his 'children a sacred time for the renewing and purifying of their hearts', which demonstrates the mercy and goodness of God, which is recalled in the Book of Deuteronomy

for what great nation is there that has a god so near to it as the LORD our God is to us, whenever we call on him? And what great nation is there, that has statutes and ordinances so righteous as all this law which I set before you this day (Deut 4: 7-8).

The point here is that God has given mankind the blueprint for eternal salvation and has left the door open to Him for guidance and solutions. In this "sacred time" the Church in the Mass Lectionary for Ash Wednesday has assigned readings from the prophet Joel who challenges the faithful

"Yet even now," says the LORD, "return to me with all your heart, with fasting and weeping and mourning; and rend your hearts and not your garments." Return to the LORD, your God, for he is

¹¹ *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, CCC 1847 and 1849

gracious and merciful, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love, and repents of evil (Joel 2: 12-13).

Pope Paul VI in his Apostolic Constitution *Paenitemini* urged the faithful to do penance – ‘By divine law all the faithful are required to do penance’.¹² So, in conformity with Jesus who fasted forty days before he began his public ministry, the Church sets aside this season for the benefit of the faithful where one has the opportunity to return to God with all one’s heart and soul and might in the confident hope that with true repentance one will avoid the justice of God for sin – and the Preface takes up the theme of purification through penance.

Then, in having been freed from ‘disordered affections’, the faithful ‘may deal with the things of this passing world as to hold rather to the things that eternally endure’. Here one prays that through true repentance one’s focus will be on the ‘things that eternally endure’. Such is the force of the word “as”, which implies a change in one’s ways; for it is through dealing with the things of this passing world – including those that are the cause of ‘disordered affections’ – that one has the grace and confidence in God to hold to things that eternally endure. Furthermore, the prophet Isaiah stated, ‘Seek the LORD while he may be found, call upon him while he is near; let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts; let them turn to the LORD, that he may have mercy on him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.’ (Is. 55: 6-7). In this prayer of the Preface, God places the terms and conditions for a true Lenten conversion before the faithful as they enter the great Prayer of Thanksgiving to God.

In the second of the Lenten Prefaces to be examined, Preface VIII has the following prayer at the heart of its Preface:

By the mystery of the Incarnation,
he has led the human race that walked in darkness
into the radiance of the faith
and has brought those born in slavery to ancient sin
through the waters of regeneration
to make them your adopted children.

Without the Incarnation, the Paschal Mystery would not have occurred in the way that it did so it is appropriate that in this time of Lent that the Church should recall the Incarnation – for the passion, death and resurrection of our Lord required the Incarnation. John the Evangelist, speaking of the Incarnation, says ‘God so loved the

¹² Paul VI, Apostolic Constitution *Paenitemini* (February 17, 1966), Chapter III, I.1

world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life' (Jn. 3: 16). The point made by this prayer is that through the Paschal Mystery, the faithful have become God's adopted children through Baptism. Baptism, evident in the phrase, "through the waters of regeneration", is one of the focal points for this season as *Sacrosanctum concilium* clarifies: 'the two elements which are especially characteristic of Lent – the recalling of baptism or the preparation for it, and penance – should be given greater emphasis in the liturgy and in liturgical catechesis'.¹³ Accordingly, this Preface highlights the effects of baptism when it states that we are made 'your adopted children'. The giving of the Law to Moses and the many prophecies, attest to God's intention of drawing us closer to God as humankind walked in the darkness of sin and wrongdoing. The Preface gives one an indication of what this situation was: 'the human race...walked in darkness', which is foretold by Isaiah, 'the people who walked in darkness have seen a great light' (Is. 9: 2b). The prophet foretelling the wonderful things that God was intending to do gives hope to people that they will experience God's light. Indeed, the theme of "light" runs through the whole of Scripture beginning with God's first act of creation separating light and darkness until Christ is revealed as the light – 'I am the light of the world' (Jn. 9: 5). However, it is in the Book of Wisdom that 'a pouring out of God's glory' is conveyed as a reflection of the eternal light, 'and is superior to all created light' (see Wis. 7: 24-30) and here the symbolism attains a level of development which the New Testament will employ more fully'.¹⁴ The Gospel of Luke picks up on the point made by Isaiah when he states, 'Through the tender mercy of our God, when the day shall dawn upon us, from on high to give light to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace' (Lk 1: 78-79), which was a reference to Christ. We, the faithful, are invited to commit ourselves to him in faith because he is 'the way, and the truth, and the life' (Jn. 14: 6).

In the first Preface of the Passion of the Lord the unfolding of the Paschal Mystery becomes more focussed. Here God's love is fully revealed:

For through the saving Passion of your Son
the whole world has received a heart
to confess the infinite power of your majesty,
since by the wondrous power of the Cross
your judgement on the world is now revealed

¹³ SC, §109

¹⁴ Xavier Leon-Dufour, *Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, p. 316

and the authority of Christ crucified.

In this prayer, the Cross is pivotal: God's judgement for sin is revealed in the Cross; God's mercy and power to save is revealed through the Cross; and by submitting himself to death on the Cross (see Philippians 2: 8), Christ has been given all authority in heaven and on earth (see Matt. 28: 18). Christ's Passion and Death and subsequent Resurrection are, indeed, salvific. In the words of the opening of this prayer, the Preface ponders the 'saving Passion of your Son' in which was the redemption of mankind. Christ trusted God – accepting what was asked of him as a lamb that is led to slaughter (see Jer. 11: 19) and, praying in the Garden of Gethsemane he submitted to the will of his Father (see Mk. 14: 36) – and entered willingly into his Passion and Death. This is the crux of the salvation of mankind: God gave us His only begotten Son to suffer and to die so that we might be reconciled to Him. Therefore, we have 'received a heart to confess the infinite power of your majesty'. According to Leon-Dufour, 'In the concrete and global anthropology that we find in the Bible, man's heart is the very source of his conscious, intelligent and free personality, the place of his decisive choices, the place of the unwritten Law (Rev. 2: 15) and of the mysterious action of God.'¹⁵ In one's heart a man has the option to listen to and respond to the actions of God or to ignore them. In this Preface the faithful are reminded that we have 'received a heart to confess', which places the onus on each to do exactly that – to respond to God.

As has been noted previously, sin entered the world through the disobedience of one man, Adam, and man has been reconciled to God through the obedience of one man, Jesus. Hence, the Cross became the symbol of God's punishment for sin for God, in His justice, as recorded in the Book of Exodus, demanded punishment for the wrong committed against Him, 'now therefore let me alone, that my wrath may burn hot against them' (Ex. 32: 10) but Moses, at that time, allayed God's anger. Indeed, it was necessary for someone to suffer for, as recorded by the prophet Isaiah, 'the righteous one, my servant, shall make many righteous and he shall bear their iniquities' (Is. 53: 11b). So the cross was God's judgement of mankind for the sin of disobedience; the cross was also a symbol of God's saving power. The prophet Jeremiah had foretold, 'But, O LORD of hosts, who judgest righteously ... let me see thy vengeance upon them, for to thee have I committed my cause' (Jer. 11: 20) and God's response was to

¹⁵ Ibid. p. 228

raise Jesus from the dead. Christ's obedience to and trust in God resulted in God exalting 'him and bestowed on him the name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father' (Phil. 2: 9-11). This had been foretold by Isaiah (see Is. 52: 13) and also by the prophet Daniel (see Dn. 7: 14). And further, Saint Paul, in his Letter to the Romans explains, 'God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Since, therefore, we are now justified by his blood, much more shall we will be saved by him from the wrath of God' (Rom. 5: 8-9). The consequence of Christ's obedience was his exaltation, which had a flow-on effect in that all mankind has been redeemed. This fact is a cause for great rejoicing as the Preface concludes with the proclamation 'Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God', which leads into the Eucharistic Prayer.

Prefaces of Christmastide and their associated *Communicantes* prayers

At this point in the survey of the Prefaces, it is opportune to examine in detail those Prefaces and the accompanying *Communicantes* and *Hanc igitur* prayers as particular additions to the Roman Canon – these include Christmas, the Epiphany, Holy Thursday and Easter.¹⁶ These have been selected because of the close association the Prefaces have with the *Communicantes* and *Hanc igitur* prayers in the Roman Canon. Throughout the discussion, the focus will be on how and what the words and structure of the prayers convey about God and, in particular, about His plan of salvation as revealed in these seasonal prayers; not only intra-text but also between the texts of the 1974 and 2010 translations of the Eucharistic Prayers. It is necessary to complete a comparative study of these texts because the *Communicantes* and *Hanc igitur* prayers associated with these Prefaces convey subtle differing understandings of God. To begin with, the analysis will focus on the Preface for the Nativity of the Lord, followed by the one for the feasts of the Epiphany; of Easter; of the Ascension and of Pentecost.

Preface 1 for Christmas

1974

Father, all powerful and ever-living
God,
we do well always and everywhere to

Preface 1 for the Nativity of the

Lord 2010

It is truly right and just, our duty and
our salvation,
always and everywhere to give you

¹⁶ See Appendix G.

give you thanks
through Jesus Christ our Lord.

In the wonder of the Incarnation
your eternal Word has brought to the
eyes of faith
a new and radiant vision of your
glory.
In him we see our God made visible
and so are caught up in love of the
God we cannot see.

And so, with all the choirs of angels in
heaven
we proclaim your glory
and join in their unending hymn of
praise:

Holy, holy, holy...

thanks,
Lord, holy Father, almighty and
eternal God.

For in the mystery of the Word made
flesh
a new light of your glory has shone
upon the eyes of our mind,
so that, as we recognize in him God
made visible,
we may be caught up through him in
love of things invisible.

And so, with Angels and Archangels,
with Thrones and Dominions,
and with all the hosts and Powers of
heaven,
we sing the hymn of your glory,
as without end we acclaim:

Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God of
hosts...

The relevant texts under discussion have been highlighted in yellow. When the texts of the prayer appropriate to the feast are examined, the differences in the ideas expressed become apparent. In the 1974 translation, the prayer speaks of the “wonder” of the Incarnation – a word that is somewhat vague in that it implies something admirable. The use of this term suggests amazement and astonishment at something remarkable – in this case, the Incarnation. However, in this instance, the mystery of the Incarnation is underscored through the use of that noun because one generally uses this word to convey admiration at anything that may occur naturally or even at something that is miraculous – and it yet is phrased in such a way that it is construed as something to be admired. In the reality of the Incarnation, though, there is something more profound and miraculous: God became man – ‘the Word became flesh and dwelt among us’ (Jn. 1: 14)]. In the 2010 translation the consequence of God’s action of the Incarnation is what happens to us – ‘we (are) caught up’ through Jesus ‘in love of things invisible’. The dynamics of the prayer is reversed from that of the translation of 1974. Whereas the subject of the action in the 1974 translation is the assembly at Mass (‘we do well’), in the 2010 translation, God is the subject of the action (‘For in the mystery of the Word made flesh’) and we are caught up in the consequence of that action. God, in the course of divine revelation concerning the salvation of mankind, far exceeded all

that man had hoped for because He sent His own ‘beloved Son’ (see Mk. 1: 1 and Lk. 1: 55, 68). We believe that Jesus of Nazareth is the eternal Son of God made man. ‘He “came from God” (Jn. 13: 3), “descended from heaven” (Jn. 3: 13; 6: 33), and “came in the flesh” (1 Jn. 4: 2). For “the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father ... and from his fullness have we all received, grace upon grace” (Jn. 1: 14, 16)’.¹⁷

The prayer of the Preface of the 2010 translation continues using the verb “has shone” in the present perfect. Now the use of the verb in the present perfect in the English language is to indicate that something in the past is important for the present so as well as an action in the past that continues in the present, the use of the verb “has shone” would indicate that God’s glory had been revealed in the past and that ‘a new light of your glory’ has been made manifest in and through the Incarnation and we believe this to be God became man. This new manifestation of God in the Incarnation is the next and ultimate step in His divine revelation to mankind. And this ‘new light’, in turn, is God revealing Himself in a new and dramatic way as John the Evangelist had noted above in the Prologue to his gospel. Furthermore, this “glory” of God has been made manifest ‘upon the eyes of our mind’ (2010 translation). This revelation of God manifesting Himself on the ‘eyes of our mind’ depends on faith. Faith is a gift from God as is the ability to think and reason and so, with the help of the Holy Spirit ‘who moves the heart and converts it to God, (He) opens the eyes of the mind and “makes it easy for all to accept and believe the truth”’.¹⁸ The culmination of the light of God’s glory shining upon us and God giving us the freedom to approach the mystery of the Incarnation with faith and reason, the hoped for result prayed for is that “as” – that is, in terms of – ‘we recognize in him (that is, in Jesus) God made visible’ (see Jn. 1: 14 ‘and the Word became flesh and dwelt among us’) and ‘through him (that is, Jesus, again) we may be caught up in love of things invisible’.

The reference to ‘things invisible’ implies things that would not normally be able to be seen. It has a deeper scope and meaning than the 1974 translation of: ‘and so are caught up in love of the God we cannot see’ – there is a subtle difference between two. The latter translation restricts the “unseen” to God alone whereas the 2010 translation is a reference to a whole other world of heaven including angels and of course God. These (‘invisible things’) are the powers that we invoke and join with in

¹⁷ See CCC 423

¹⁸ CCC 153

one voice before we conclude the prayer of each Preface. As Saint Paul noted speaking about the supremacy of Christ: ‘He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation, for in him all things were created, things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or authorities – all things were created through him and for him’ (Col. 1: 15-16).¹⁹ Therefore, the 2010 translation broadens the scope not only of what we are caught up in, it also introduces the voices with which we, the faithful, join in praising God.

Latin Text	Special form of the <i>Communicantes</i> 1974	Proper form of the <i>Communicantes</i> 2010
Communicantes, et (noctem sacratissimam) diem sacratissimum celebrantes, (qua) quo beatae Mariae intemerata virginitas huic mundo edit Salvatore: sed et memoriam venerantes, in primis eiusdem gloriosae semper Virginis Mariae, Genetricis eiusdem Dei et Domini nostril Iesu Christi:	In union with the whole Church we celebrate that day(night) when Mary without loss of her virginity gave the world its saviour. We honour Mary, the ever-virgin mother of Jesus Christ our Lord and God.	Celebrating the most sacred night (day) when blessed Mary the immaculate Virgin brought forth the Savior for this world, and in communion with those whose memory we venerate, especially the glorious ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ, †

All the proper forms of the *Communicantes* prayers in the 2010 translation begins with the participle, “celebrating” as a ‘verbal adjective’ where the action of celebrating is continuous and not contained by time or place. The action describes what

¹⁹ *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, ed. Robert Weber et al. 4th Emended Edition prepared by Roger Gryson et al., renders this passage as, ‘(15) Qui est imago Dei invisibilis, primogenitus omnis creaturae, (16) quia in ipso condita sunt universa in caelis et in terra, visibilia et invisibilia, sive throni sive dominationes sive principatus sive potestates omnia per ipsum et in ipsum create sunt’.

is happening, “a celebration” and it also has the added benefit of acting as a conjunction by joining the action that preceded it with what will follow in the Eucharistic Prayer. Secondly, the use of the phrase ‘most sacred night’ carries more weight than using “that” in the 1974 translation because it establishes a reason for celebrating the event.

The prayer of the *Communicantes*, as one would expect, focuses on the event of the Nativity of Christ. The point to note here, is that Mary ‘*edidit Salvatorem*’, which in the 1974 translation was rendered as “gave” but in the 2010 translation is “brought forth”. Not only was the word “gave” an inaccurate translation since the Latin for the verb “give” is “*do, dare*” whereas to give birth to a child, in Latin there is the option of using the verb ‘*pario, parere*’ but the Church has chosen instead to use the verb, ‘*edo, edere*’ that is (to bring forth). This was no accident because Mary not only gave birth to a person, Jesus, she also “brought forth” someone who pre-existed and was made manifest, namely the saviour of the world. The portion of the *Communicantes* prayer which mentions Mary, ‘on this most holy night/day’ names Mary’s role in the mystery of salvation that is being celebrated that is, on the saving action of God who, earlier, at the Incarnation invited Mary to ‘conceive in (her) womb and bear a son, and ... call his name Jesus’ (Lk. 1: 31). “Jesus” in Hebrew means “God saves”.²⁰ The word “gave”, then, suggests that Mary was the subject of the action of presenting Christ to the world whereas the phrase “brought forth” – which implies to produce or to expose to public view or to bring (something) to light – suggests Mary’s participation in the plan of God to present Christ to the world as the Saviour. So, both the Preface and the *Communicantes* prayer unveil the mystery of salvation with particular reference to the Incarnation and the Nativity of our Lord.

At the feast of the Epiphany, the Church celebrates the manifestation of Jesus to the Gentiles in the persons of the Magi. In the Preface of the Epiphany mention is made of Christ being the light of the nations however, the way that this revelation is announced in each of the Prefaces, grammatically, does impact on the message we receive in this prayer.

Preface of the Epiphany
1974

Today you revealed in Christ your
eternal plan of salvation

Preface of the Epiphany of the
Lord 2010

For today you have revealed the
mystery

²⁰ See CCC 430

and showed him as the light of the
peoples.
Now that his glory has shone among
us
you have renewed humanity in his
immortal image.

of our salvation in Christ
as a light for the nations,
and, when he appeared in our mortal
nature,
you made us new by the glory of his
immortal nature.

In the 1974 translation the past simple of the verb is used – “you revealed” – implying that an action in the past has been completed in the past; whereas, in the 2010 translation – ‘you have revealed’ – the present perfect form of the verb is used which has an implication on the message of the prayer. By using the present perfect form of the verb in English, the idea conveyed is that something in the past is important in the present.²¹ In this case, God’s revelation (which liturgically refers to God’s mighty deeds mystically made present) of His Son to the Gentiles is something that, for grammatical purposes, happened on the historical event of the Epiphany, which we celebrate “today” – on the feast of the Epiphany – and which is still relevant and important for us today and always. In addition, the use of the word “plan” in the phrase ‘your eternal plan of salvation’ in the 1974 translation implies that one might know and/or understand this “plan”. However, since it is God’s plan, it implies that some of it might be clear but it would be presumptuous to assume that all of it were clear to all; indeed, ‘no one comprehends the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God’ (1 Cor. 2: 11). Hence, the use of the term “mystery” in the 2010 translation is more appropriate in that God has unfolded His plan of salvation over time culminating in the Passion, Death and Resurrection of His only Son – and this plan continues through the work of the Church.

The feast of the Epiphany contrasts with the Nativity of our Lord not only in prayer but also in what is being manifested. As noted above, the feast of the Nativity focuses on the birth of the Messiah when Mary brought forth the Saviour of the world; in contrast, the feast of the Epiphany focuses on the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles. ‘The great feast of the Epiphany celebrates the adoration of the wise men (*magi*) from the East...in the magi, representatives of the neighbouring pagan religions, the Gospel sees the first-fruits of the nations, who welcome the good news of salvation through the Incarnation’.²² This follows the pattern of God’s divine revelation of Himself ‘it (the gospel) is the power of God for salvation to every one who has faith, to

²¹ Op. cit., *Oxford Guide to English Grammar*, N° 65 [2]

²² CCC 528

the Jew first and also to the Greek' (Rom. 1: 16) and further, when Jesus, in conversation with the Samaritan woman at the well said, 'salvation is from the Jews' (Jn. 4: 22c). So, in the unveiling of the mystery of God's plan of salvation, the Jews were the first to receive this divine revelation and through them, namely in Christ, salvation would come for all. Reflecting this reality: the Nativity manifested Christ as the Messiah and at the Epiphany, Christ is manifested as saviour of all. Indeed the message of the Gospel also follows this pattern for Jesus promised his disciples the gift of the Holy Spirit and through Him 'you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth' (Acts 1: 8). And it should be noted that this was not only an instruction but also the *modus operandi* of the disciples because when Paul and Barnabas preached they first approached the Jews of a particular location and when the message of the Gospel was rejected by them then they preached to the pagans – 'it was necessary that the word of God should be spoken first to you (but) since you thrust it from you and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, behold, we turn to the Gentiles' (Acts 13: 46).

In the season of Christmas the *communicantes* prayer for the Epiphany highlights the Incarnation a second time for the Church prays:

Celebrating the most sacred day
on which your Only Begotten Son,
eternal with you in your glory,
appeared in a human body, truly sharing our flesh,
and in communion with those whose memory we venerate,
especially the glorious ever-Virgin Mary,
Mother of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ, †

The focus of the Incarnation is reflected in the words, 'your Only Begotten Son, eternal with you in your glory, appeared in a human body, truly sharing our flesh'. This is a reason for great joy for 'taking up Saint John's expression, 'The Word became flesh' (Jn. 1: 14) the Church calls "Incarnation" the fact that the Son of God assumed a human nature in order to accomplish our salvation in it'.²³ Unfortunately, due to the complexity of this mystery of the Incarnation, the Church had to pronounce the true divinity/humanity of Christ on a number of occasions including against Gnostic Docetism, which denied Christ's humanity; against Nestorianism, which regarded Christ as a human person joined to the divine person of God's Son; and Monophysitism, which argued that Christ's human nature ceased to exist when the

²³ CCC 461

divine person of God's Son assumed it to name a few.²⁴ Therefore, 'The Church thus confesses that Jesus is inseparably true God and true man. He is truly the Son of God who, without ceasing to be God and Lord, became a man and our brother'.²⁵ Hence there is great joy not only in the mystery of the Incarnation made manifest in the feast of the Epiphany; it is also a moment of great joy because Jew and Gentile are caught up in the plan of salvation of God.

Prefaces of Eastertide and their associated *Communicantes* prayers

At this point, a select number of Prefaces of the most solemn season of Easter will next be examined. Easter is the centrepiece of the Church's celebration for, at its apex, the Paschal Triduum begins with the Lord's Last Supper – with the institution of the Eucharist – and celebrates the Passion, Death and Resurrection of Jesus. The Easter season then continues for the next fifty days after Easter until Pentecost. The Preface of the Most Holy Eucharist (for Holy Thursday) will be the first of the Prefaces to be examined in this section.

Preface for Holy Thursday 1974

He is the true and eternal priest
who established this unending
sacrifice.
He offered himself as victim for our
deliverance
and taught us to make this offering in
his memory.
As we eat his body which he gave
for us,
we grow in strength.
As we drink his blood which he
poured out for us,
we are washed clean.

Preface of the Most Holy Eucharist 2010

For he is the true and eternal Priest,
who instituted the pattern of an
everlasting sacrifice,
and was the first to offer himself as
the saving Victim,
commanding us to make this offering
as his memorial.
As we eat his flesh that was
sacrificed for us, we are made
strong,
and, as we drink his Blood that was
poured out for us,
we are washed clean.

In this Preface, the Church commemorates that evening when Jesus, celebrating the Last Supper with his apostles, instituted the Sacrament of the Eucharist – namely that the bread and wine after his words of consecration would become His Body and

²⁴ CCC, Nos 465, 466 and 467

²⁵ CCC 469

Blood. This “Blood” would be the foundation of the New Covenant between God and man, a covenant that would be completed with his Passion and Death on the Friday of his crucifixion and with his Resurrection on the following Sunday.

In comparing the two translations of the Prefaces there are not many differences in the use of words and phrases however, there are some differences that are worthy of note. The use of capital letters in the 2010 translation for the words “Priest”, “Victim” and “Blood” stand out. *Ratio Translationis* points out that the use of capitalization in liturgical, biblical, theological or doctrinal texts ‘is far more than mere convention, and may therefore affect understanding of that which is being read and communicated to the listener’.²⁶ By using capital letters, the Church is making a statement about the divinity of Christ and through this, the salvific power of His blood and of the priestly office that he holds. In the Letter to the Hebrews, Christ is the eternal high priest not by tribal descent but according to the order of Melchizedek ‘priest of the Most High God’ (Heb. 7: 1). The Letter to the Hebrews discusses priestly function and how the Levitical priesthood of Moses served its purpose by offering blood sacrifices to God for among other things, the atonement of sins. As noted by John 7: 19 and Acts 13: 38-41, ‘on their own admission the Jews were never able to observe the Law in its entirety without violating the least of its precepts (and so) every year on the Day of Atonement the children of Israel ask God’s forgiveness for their transgressions of the Law’.²⁷ On that Day, the high priest would enter the Temple, sprinkle the sacrificial blood on the mercy seat of God in the Holy of Holies and pray for the forgiveness of sins which the Book of Leviticus (Chapter 16) describes in detail.

However, the author of the Letter to the Hebrews argues that since God has sworn an oath that He will never retract, ‘you are a priest of the order of Melchizedek, and for ever’ (see Gn. 14: 18 and Ps. 110: 4), Christ is that Priest and ‘this makes Jesus the surety of a better covenant’ (Heb. 7: 22). The earlier commandment is thus abolished because it was neither effective nor useful since the Law could not make anyone perfect; but now this commandment is replaced by something better – the hope that brings us nearer to God (see Heb. 7: 18-19). Therefore, since the blood of animals sacrificed were ineffective under the Law; the Blood of Christ as the Victim, because of the priestly office that Christ holds and because of the divine status that He has guarantees the acceptance by God of Jesus’ self-immolating sacrifice on the cross. ‘The

²⁶ RT §78

²⁷ CCC 578

perfect fulfillment of the Law could be the work of none but the divine legislator, born subject to the Law in the person of the Son...Jesus fulfills the Law to the point of taking upon himself “the curse of the Law” incurred by those who do not “abide by things written in the book of the Law, and do them,” for his death took place to redeem them “from the transgressions under the first covenant” (see Jer. 31: 33 and Isa. 42: 3, 6).²⁸ In this way, Christ is both the perfect Victim and Priest, as He is both human and divine in the one person, Jesus, and that, consequently, his Blood has become the perfect means of salvation. In the way that the 1974 translation has rendered those words, the full impact and meaning of the message is obscured.

Another point of departure is in the translations of the Prefaces and which translates the Latin *praecepit* as “taught” (1974) and “commanding” (2010). Both translations of this Latin word apply here but the ways that they have been translated in 1974 and 2010 do convey a subtle difference in meaning – *praecepit*: “commanding us to make this offering” is a translation of, “*nos..praecepit offerre*”, which means “he ordered/commanded”. In the former, the word “taught” conveys the sense of an instruction; of imparting information or knowledge of something to someone and has a passive connotation in that the teaching may take place but leaning or the following of an instruction depends on the receptivity and condition on the other person. In using “taught” in the 1974 translation, the prayer in a modest way says something about what Jesus imparted about ‘this offering in his memory’ in that he gave an instruction on the way to remember him.

In contrast, the 2010 translation uses the word “commanding”, which is stronger than “taught” in the sense that “command” suggests the giving of an order and that the one giving the command has authority over the ones receiving the order. In this case, Jesus commands ‘us to make this offering as his memorial’. “Command”, then, has the nuance that someone with authority is making a request of another, which usually gives the recipient of the order little room for manoeuvre. In this case, it is Jesus who commands us and, as he has done so in the gospels, it is a strong suggestion for our own good. One has the option to follow it or not, as in the case of ‘you are my friends if you do as I command you’ (Jn. 15: 14). And what he has commanded is based on love, which implies mutual respect and, in this way he respects the freedom of the individual. Conversely, if one were not to obey his command, then one would be the poorer for it

²⁸ CCC 580

because one would not know the intimacy of the friendship of Christ. So, in a subtle way the use of the word “command” in the 2010 translation not only has the power of compulsion to it but also, it does allow for the freedom of the individual to respond appropriately; whereas the use of the verb “taught” in the 1974 translation suggests an instruction, which is dependent on the receptivity of the person.

Now the memorial that is being celebrated on this evening is the memorial of the Supper of the Lord. Throughout, the two translations of the prayers of *Communicantes*, *Hanc Igitur* and *Qui pridie* – particular to this celebration – will be examined in order to clarify the image of God conveyed.

Latin Text	Special form of the <i>Communicantes</i> 1974	Proper form of the <i>Communicantes</i> 2010
Communnican- tes et diem sacratissimum celebrantes, quo Dominus noster Iesus Christus pro nobis est traditus: sed et memoriam venerantes, in primis gloriosae semper Virginis Mariae, Genetricis ejusdem Dei et Domini nostri Iesu Christi:	In union with the whole Church we celebrate that day when Jesus Christ, our Lord, was betrayed for us. We honour Mary, the ever-virgin mother of Jesus Christ our Lord and God.	Celebrating the most sacred day on which our Lord Jesus Christ was handed over for our sake, and in communion with those whose memory we venerate, especially the glorious ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ, †

Latin Text	Special form of the <i>Hanc Igitur</i> 1974	Proper form of the <i>Hanc Igitur</i> 2010
Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostrae, sed et cunctae familiae tuae, quam tibi offerimus ob diem, in qua Dominus noster Iesus Christus	Father, accept this offering from your whole family in memory of the day when Jesus Christ, our Lord, gave the mysteries of his body and blood for his disciples to	Therefore, Lord, we pray: graciously accept this oblation of our service, that of your whole family, which we make to you as we observe the day on which our Lord Jesus

traddit discipulis
suis Corporis et
Sanguinis sui
mysteria
celebranda:
quaesumus,
Domine, ut
placates accipias:
diesque nostros
in tua pace
disponas, atque
ab aeterna
damnatione nos
eripi et in
electorum
tuorum jubeas
grege numerari.

celebrate.
Grant us your peace in
this life,
save us from final
damnation,
and count us among
those you have chosen.
He joins his hands.
(Through Christ our
Lord. Amen.)

Christ
handed on the mysteries
of his Body and Blood
for his disciples to
celebrate;
order our days in your
peace,
and command that we be
delivered from eternal
damnation
and counted among the
flock of those you have
chosen.
He joins his hands.
[Through Christ our
Lord. Amen]

Latin Text	Special form of the <i>Qui</i> <i>Pridie</i> 1974	Proper form of the <i>Qui</i> <i>Pridie</i> 2010
Qui pridie, quam pro nostra omniumque salute pateretur, hoc est hodie, accepit panem ...	The day before he suffered to save us and all men, that is today, ...	On the day before he was to suffer for our salvation and the salvation of all, that is today, ...

The Eucharistic Prayer has three references to and reminders of God's dramatic climax of the mystery of mankind's salvation. Throughout there is a link in the themes of the *Communicantes* prayer and of *Hanc igitur* and the *Qui pridie* prayers in the 2010 translation and these will now be explored. The prayer *Communicantes* focuses on the surrender of Jesus to the Jewish authorities – 'celebrating the most sacred day on which our Lord Jesus Christ was handed over for our sake' – and in this way links the events of Holy Thursday and the Last Supper with the events of Good Friday. The *Hanc igitur* prayer focuses on the institution of the Eucharist – 'as we observe the day on which our Lord Jesus Christ handed on the mysteries of his Body and Blood for his disciples to celebrate'. This links Holy Thursday with Good Friday because his Body, which was broken in the symbol of the breaking of the bread at the Last Supper was fulfilled on Good Friday in his Passion; and the Blood that was poured out on Good Friday was prefigured in the promise of a New Covenant on the evening before at the Last Supper when Jesus took the chalice of wine and pronounced the words of consecration "this is

my Blood”. The *Qui pridie* prayer links with both prayers in that ‘on the day before he was to suffer for our salvation and the salvation of all, that is today’ commemorates what Jesus did at the Last Supper by providing the Church with the gift of the Eucharist which gift found its fulfilment on Good Friday and Easter Sunday.

This memorial and these prayers are at the heart of the mystery of our salvation! That which God had promised, Christ was now fulfilling on that ‘most sacred day’ when he offered and gave Himself as spiritual food for the nourishment of the soul. The multiplication of the loaves and fish, for example, is central to an understanding of what Jesus instituted at the Last Supper. Throughout the incident reported in the Gospel of John (6: 1-70) as well as in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt. 14: 13-21; Mk. 6: 32-44; and Lk. 9: 10-17) the allusion to the Eucharist is made on a number of occasions. Most strikingly is the reference in the Gospel of John where he states that Jesus “gave thanks” which ‘in John (*eucharistēsas*) is more allusive to the Eucharist than in the Synoptic word (*eulogēsen*) [however] Mk. 8:6 and Mt. 15:36 use *eucharistēsas* in their second account of the multiplication of the loaves; so also does 1 Cor. 11:23’.²⁹ In Chapter Six of his gospel, John draws the distinction between manna (bread from heaven) that the Jews under Moses ate in the desert and the true Bread from heaven, namely Jesus himself in the Eucharistic discourse of Jesus. Manna was able to nourish human life but the true Bread of God that comes down from heaven is Christ himself – ‘and the Word became flesh and dwelt among us’ (Jn. 1:14) and it is He that gives true life. In fact, Christ stated categorically, not only ‘I am the bread of life’ (Jn. 6:48) but also, ‘if any one eats of this bread, he will live for ever; and the bread which I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh’ (Jn. 6:51). This was obviously a core teaching of Jesus for, when the Jews disputed this among themselves and even many of his disciples turned their backs on him when he reiterated his teaching:

Truly truly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you; he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise them up at the last day. For my flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed (Jn. 6:53-54).

Accordingly, whilst many refused to believe in him from that moment on, Christ did not compromise his teaching for, indeed, he re-emphasised the point: ‘he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him’ (Jn. 6:56). Therefore, since Christ is

²⁹ Bruce Vawter, ‘The Gospel According to John’, *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, paragraph 90 p. 435

the bread of life for the world that must be eaten, which also has echoes in Saint Paul's Letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11:24) 'there should be little doubt that it intends to connect the Eucharist with the redemptive death of Christ'.³⁰

In the Preface for Easter, the joy of the resurrection is explored. This joy is echoed in the words and phrases used in the translation of 2010 and which lend support to the height to which God is esteemed. In comparison, the 1974 translation would seem rather bland in the way that syntax and grammar are used to convey the mystery of salvation.

**Preface of Easter I
1974**

Father, all powerful and ever-living
God,
we do well always and everywhere to
give you thanks
through Jesus Christ our Lord.

We praise you with greater joy than
ever
on this Easter night [day],
when Christ became our paschal
sacrifice.

He is the true Lamb who took away
the sins of the world.
By dying he destroyed our death;
by rising he restored our life.

And so, with all the choirs of angels

...

**Preface I of Easter
2010**

It is truly right and just, our duty and
our salvation,
at all times to acclaim you, O Lord,
but (on this night / on this day / in this
time) above all
to laud you yet more gloriously,
when Christ our Passover has been
sacrificed.

For he is the true Lamb
who has taken away the sins of the
world;
by dying he has destroyed our death,
and by rising, restored our life.

Therefore, overcome with paschal
joy,
every land, every people exults in
your praise
and even the heavenly Powers, with
the angelic hosts ...

In using terms like "to acclaim" and "to laud" in the 2010 translation of the Preface there are clear references to the joyous experience of Easter and the awe in which God is held, which are not as adequately conveyed through the words 'we praise you with greater joy than ever on this Easter night/day'. These words in the 1974 translation suggest a sense of joy that is greater than on any other occasion yet the word "praise" is something that one would do on any Sunday and feast day and does not contain the added degree conveyed in the phrase 'to acclaim ... and to laud you' (2010).

³⁰ Ibid. paragraph 97 p. 437

The word “praise” suggests expressing or commending the excellence or merits of someone whereas, the word “laud” suggests singing and celebrating the praises of someone in an act of worship. In the 2010 translation, then, rather than ‘giving thanks’ the Church encourages the faithful ‘to acclaim you’, which suggest shouting applause and enthusiastically extolling someone – in this case, God. This sense of overwhelming joy is continued in the 2010 translation with ‘overcome with paschal joy’ where the faithful everywhere “exult”, that is, rejoice greatly; even leap for joy, in one’s elation of this great mystery that the Church is celebrating.

The *Communicantes* and *Hanc igitur* prayers from the Mass of the Paschal Vigil until the Second Sunday of Easter highlight the importance of the resurrection in the mystery of our salvation. According to the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, ‘Jesus’ Resurrection glorifies the name of the Saviour God, for from that time on it is the name of Jesus that fully manifests the supreme power of the “name which is above every name”’.³¹ In fact, according to Saint Paul, Jesus’ name is so revered that ‘at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth’ (Phil. 2:10).

Latin Text	Special form of the <i>Communicantes</i> 1974	Proper form of the <i>Communicantes</i> 2010
Communicantes, et (noctem sacratissimam) diem sacratissimum celebrantes Resurrectionis Domini nostril Iesu Christi secundum carnem: sed et memoriam venerantes, in primis gloriosae semper Virginis Mariae, Genetricis eiusdem Dei et	In union with the whole Church we celebrate that day(night) when Jesus Christ, our Lord, rose from the dead in his human body. We honour Mary, the ever-virgin mother of Jesus Christ our Lord and God.	Celebrating the most sacred night (day) of the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ in the flesh, and in communion with those whose memory we venerate, especially the glorious ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ, †

³¹ CCC 434

Domini nostri
Iesu Christi:

Latin Text	Special form of the <i>Hanc Igitur</i> 1974	Proper form of the <i>Hanc Igitur</i> 2010
Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostrae, sed et cunctae familiae tuae, quam tibi offerimus pro his quoque, quos regenerare dignatus es ex aqua et Spiritu Santo, tribuens eis remissionem omnium peccatorum, quaesumus, Domine, ut placates accipias: diesque nostros in tua pace disponas, atque ab aeterna damnatione nos eripi et in electorum tuorum iubeas grege numerari.	Father, accept this offering from your whole family and from those born into the new life of water and the Holy Spirit, with all their sins forgiven. Grant us your peace in this life, save us from final damnation, and count us among those you have chosen. He joins his hands. (Through Christ our Lord. Amen.)	Therefore, Lord, we pray: graciously accept this oblation of our service, that of your whole family; which we make to you also for those to whom you have been pleased to give the new birth of water and the Holy Spirit, granting them forgiveness of all their sins; order our days in your peace, and command that we be delivered from eternal damnation and counted among the flock of those you have chosen. He joins his hands. [Through Christ our Lord. Amen.]

The reverence with which this feast is celebrated continues in particular in the prayers of *Communicantes* and the *Hanc igitur* for Easter in the 2010 translation. There the *Communicantes* prayer begins with “celebrating” and by using the word “celebrating” in reference to the Resurrection, the implication of the use of the present participle as a conjunction in reference to this feast suggests an on-going event and reinforces the “memorial” aspect of the Mass. In the 1974 translation the use of the present tense of the verb, “we celebrate” – which has the force of an everlasting now moment in that it is an action that the faithful do from the time of the apostles – has been broken by the reference to “when”. “When” situates the event that we are celebrating in a point in

time and thereby loses its timelessness. So, the 2010 translation gives the prayer a sense of continuity.

In addition, the reference to ‘rose from the dead in his human body’ is problematic because Jesus’ body before, was not the same as after, his resurrection.³² After his resurrection, Jesus was not immediately recognizable either by Mary Magdalene, ‘saying this, she turned round and saw Jesus standing, but she did not know that it was Jesus’ (Jn. 20: 14) until he referred to her by her name. Secondly, the two disciples on the road to Emmaus also did not recognize Jesus when he joined them on their journey and as they talked to him; it was only at the breaking of bread at their meal that they did so (Lk. 24: 13-35). Furthermore, Jesus in his resurrected body was not restricted by enclosed spaces, as was the case when he appeared to the apostles in the upper room (see Lk. 24: 36-43 and Jn. 20: 19-23) where he even ate food with them. Clearly, Jesus’ body after his resurrection is not the same as the body he had before he suffered – *secundum carnem* “in the mode of the flesh” and contradicts any idea that the resurrection was purely non-physical. So, the reference to ‘in the flesh’ in the 2010 translation is better because it avoids any confusion.

The *Hanc igitur* prayers focus on the new birth that is a result of Christ’s resurrection. As Saint Paul noted, all who have been baptised into Christ Jesus ‘were baptised into his death; we were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, so that, as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life’ (Rom. 6: 3-4). Now the focus of this prayer is different between the two translations. In the 1974 translation, ‘Father, accept this offering ... from those born into the new life of water and the Holy Spirit’ the action of the verb is undertaken by the faithful – we are making the demand of God “to accept” – whereas in 2010 the prayer is underscored by an attitude of humility by entreating God (“pray”) to ‘graciously accept this oblation’ where God is central to the effect of this prayer namely, the ‘forgiveness of all their sins’ including those of the newly baptised. It would appear that forgiveness in the hope of the resurrection is central to this prayer. Indeed, the prayer in its 2010 translation ends on a poignant note: ‘order our days in your peace, and command that we be delivered from eternal damnation and counted

³² The gospels suggest that Jesus can be bodily present to his apostles and disciples as when Jesus asked Thomas to place his finger in the holes in Jesus’ hands and to place his hand in the wound where the lance pierced him in his side (see Jn 20: 24-29); then there was another occasion when Jesus was able to do things with his glorified body that are not humanly possible – such as penetrate a locked room and mingle with his apostles (see Jn 20: 19-23).

among the flock of those you have chosen'. This prayer then is not only focussed on the present but also has an eye for the future where we anticipate both particular and general judgement. The resurrection of Christ, therefore, goes beyond his resurrection but, through baptism, where we die and rise with Christ and by maintaining our lives in Christ, we pray that we might be numbered with the elect at the end of time.

Finally, the Resurrection as an event in history where God directly intervened in the history of mankind and raised Jesus from the dead is acknowledged by Saint Paul, 'I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve' (1 Cor. 15:3-4)]. The apostles preached Christ crucified and his resurrection, as can be seen in the preaching of Peter after the events of Pentecost (see Acts 1: 22-24). Indeed, according to Church teaching, the three divine persons were instrumental in the resurrection of Jesus in that

the Father's power "raised up" Christ his Son and by doing so perfectly introduced his Son's humanity, including his body, into the Trinity. Jesus is conclusively revealed as "Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his Resurrection from the dead" (Rom. 1: 3-4) and Saint Paul insists on the manifestation of God's power through the working of the Spirit who gave life to Jesus' dead humanity and called it to the glorious state of Lordship.³³

Hence the truth of Jesus' divinity is confirmed by his resurrection as he had stated before he died: 'when you have lifted up the Son of man, then you will know that I am he, and that I do nothing on my own authority but speak thus as the Father taught me' (Jn. 8:28). The resurrection, then, is the ultimate example of God's benevolent love for us begun with the Incarnation where God became flesh; and continued with his Passion and Death, which demonstrated that 'God loved us and sent his Son to be the expiation for our sins' (1Jn. 4:10) whilst we were estranged from him.

Concluding Remarks

Among the ways that this chapter has examined an understanding of God, the "*Communicantes*" and "*Hanc igitur*" prayers have been analysed with their appropriate Preface and the image of God presented was not only discussed intra-text but also between the texts of the 1974 and 2010 versions of the Eucharistic Prayers. What has

³³ CCC 648

been noted is the astounding generosity of God as His plan of salvation was gradually unveiled: ‘from his fullness have we all received, grace upon grace’ (Jn. 1:16). This theme of grace will be taken up in the next chapter suffice it to say here that this was God’s doing and was done gratuitously. The Mass is the legacy left by Christ, and it is the moment of grace par excellence for his disciples. The Mass is a prayer of thanksgiving to God and the Eucharistic Prayer in particular is the great prayer of Thanksgiving. Unfortunately, amongst the changes that occurred after the promulgation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* was that the focus of the Mass became a sacred meal. ‘There is no doubt that the (Second Vatican) Council did deepen the social and convivial aspect of the Eucharist, that was often done to the detriment of the real presence of Christ under the appearance of consecrated bread and wine and of the sacrificial nature of the memorial of the Lord’s Supper’.³⁴ In attempting to increase lay participation at Mass through the translation of the Mass into the vernacular, something was lost in the translation of 1974 in that we, rather than God had become the subject of the action of the Eucharistic celebration. The social aspect of the Mass might have been essential in restoring the participation of the laity at Mass but it had to be emphasised that we were not only partaking in a meal commemorating the Lord’s Supper but also, we were participating in and remembering the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary – highlighting one in favour of the other risks diminishing the true depth of the Paschal Mystery that we are commemorating. Aillet, in a footnote in his book, *The Old Mass and the New* states, ‘that the form of the Eucharistic celebration is not, properly speaking, *the form of a meal* but rather the form of “*eucharistia*” thanksgiving to the Lord, which was uttered at the Last Supper and fulfilled on the cross, and, thus, the form of sacrifice’.³⁵ The current translation of the Roman Canon in particular, uses elevated language to restore the sense of the sacred in the words of the Eucharistic Prayer and establishes an appropriate relationship of creature to Creator in man’s relationship with God. In this chapter, then, the focus of the discussion on the Eucharistic Prayer has been on God; in the next chapter, the discussion will focus on mankind’s relationship with God and the importance of grace in that relationship.

³⁴ Op. cit., *The Old Mass and the New*, p. 71

³⁵ Ibid. p. 71

CHAPTER 4

Mankind and the role of Grace and the Theology of Merit in the prayer of the Roman Canon

Introduction

In the previous chapter the Holy Spirit was identified in the Roman Canon as the dynamism of God's plan of salvation. This chapter will examine mankind's relationship to God, as well as the role of grace including the theology of merit as conveyed in an authentic translation of the first Eucharistic Prayer, which may heighten one's participation in the liturgy. In the light of what the Psalmist states, 'what is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou dost care for him' (Ps. 8:4), a sentiment that is repeated in Psalm 144:3 and is reiterated in Hebrews 2:6, it is apparent that with a number of references to the status of mankind in relation to God – indeed where Psalm 8 continues that God had made mankind a little less than the angels – there must be something important being conveyed here. The point that this chapter will explore is the special place that grace has in the on-going relationship between God and human beings. It was through God's grace that He created man in the first place. God is complete within the Trinitarian Godhead and so has no need of mankind to complete anything that might be lacking in the relationship of Persons of the Trinity – as there is nothing lacking in God. When Adam failed the test of his trust and obedience in God, He did not abandon him rather, promising him a Messiah: 'I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel' (Gn 3: 17). Indeed, God did not need to enter into covenantal relationships with His Chosen People, but out of graciousness and love for them He did so. It was by the grace of God that Moses was given the Law so that the Chosen people might know how to conduct themselves in the presence of God. In spite of this, again and again God had to rescue His people through the prophets. For example, the prophet Jeremiah states,

Behold the days are coming, says the LORD, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah...I will put my law within them and I will write it upon their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people... for they shall all know

me, from the least of them even to the greatest, says the LORD. (Jer. 31: 31-34).

Jeremiah anticipates this special relationship, which finds its completion in the Church through Christ ‘who has qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant, not in a written code but in the Spirit; for the written code kills, but the Spirit gives life’ (2 Cor. 3:6). As the author of Hebrews argues, ‘if that first covenant had been faultless, there would have been no occasion for a second’ (Heb. 8:7); what we have received through Christ’s act of salvation, then, is the grace to live in union with God ‘for by a single offering (Christ) has perfected for all time those who are sanctified’ (Heb. 10:14).

Overview of Grace

Sanctification is the action of the Holy Spirit in making a believer holy by instilling grace and removing sin. The Paschal mystery makes sanctification possible because by his death Christ has liberated all from sin and by his resurrection he has opened for us the way to new life – ‘this new life is above all justification that reinstates us to God’s grace, “so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life” (Rom. 6: 4; cf. 4: 25).¹ Justification has two aspects, ‘moved by grace, man turns toward God and away from sin, and so accepts forgiveness and righteousness from on high’.² This justification is unmerited and totally a gift from God. Merit, then ‘is to be ascribed in the first place to the grace of God, and secondly to man’s collaboration’ with this gift.³ Finally, grace, ‘is the help God gives us to respond to our vocation of becoming his adopted sons; it introduces us into the intimacy of the Trinitarian life’.⁴

The Constitution on the Liturgy states that ‘from liturgy... and especially from the Eucharist, as from a font, grace is poured forth upon us; and the sanctification of men in Christ and the glorification of God, to which all other activities of the Church are directed toward their end, is achieved in the most efficacious way possible’.⁵ Now, before the graces attributed to participation in and reception of the Eucharist, another sacramental rite needs to occur, namely Baptism. Because of the fault of Adam, all of humanity is born in a state of loss and at enmity with God – the state of original sin –

¹ CCC 654

² CCC 2018

³ CCC 2025

⁴ CCC 2021

⁵ Second Vatican Council. Constitution on the Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (4 December 1963) §10 (Hereafter SC)

that is the ‘the state of deprivation of original holiness and justice’.⁶ The consequence of this is that human nature is radically weakened in their natural powers to discern good and evil for there is, now, a desire in human nature for evil (concupiscence).⁷ This is because when Adam and Eve sinned, they ‘wished to become “like God” but without God and not in accordance with God (see Gn. 3:5)’.⁸ The reality is that man, in this weakened state, when he freely and intentionally chooses to commit a grievous wrong separates himself from God with the consequence that grace and mortal sin⁹ cannot coexist together. So, grace is a gift from God and the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* defines this as ‘the *favour*, the *free and undeserved help* that God gives us to respond to his call to become children of God, adoptive sons, partakers of the divine nature and of eternal life’.¹⁰ Saint Paul’s experience of the ‘free and undeserved help of God’ has coloured his understanding of how grace works. In his Epistle to the Galatians, he admits that it was the grace of God that called him to his apostolic mission and had the effect of revealing Christ, His Son to me [St Paul] (see Gal. 1:15-17). So, for Paul, grace is gratuitous and it is the favour of God and of Christ that pardons sins and causes us to overflow with divine benefits.

Furthermore, ‘*grace is a participation in the life of God*’.¹¹ It introduces us into the intimacy of Trinitarian life: by Baptism the Christian participates in the grace of Christ, the Head of his Body.

As an “adopted son” he can henceforth call God “Father”, in union with the only Son. He receives the life of the Spirit who breathes charity into him and who forms the Church.¹²

Grace, then, is not an exclusive experience in that one receives grace and then that is that. Rather, grace empowers one to share this Trinitarian experience with others and in doing so, help build up the Body of Christ. So, ‘the term grace itself emphasizes, in addition to the newness of the Christian experience, the absolute gratuity of God’s

⁶ CCCC 76: the text continues with, ‘it is a sin “contracted” by us not “committed”; it is a state of birth not a personal act’.

⁷ CCC 405 - 407

⁸ CCCC 75

⁹ According to the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, ‘mortal sin is a grave infraction of the law of God that destroys the divine life in the soul of the sinner (sanctifying grace), constituting a turning away from God. For a sin to be mortal, three conditions must be present: grave matter, full knowledge of the evil of the act, and full consent of the will’. p. 889

¹⁰ CCC 1996

¹¹ CCC 1997

¹² CCC 1997

goodness to us'¹³ in giving one a share in the life and love of God, which has an inward renewal as well as an outward movement towards others. Indeed, 'the grace of Christ is the gratuitous gift that God makes to us of his own life, infused by the Holy Spirit into our soul to heal it of sin and to sanctify it. It is the *sanctifying* or *deifying grace* received in Baptism. It is in us the source of the work of sanctification'.¹⁴

Central to an understanding of grace is the role of the sacrament of Baptism in acquiring the special relationship with God. 'Our Lord tied the forgiveness of sins to faith and Baptism: "Go into the whole world and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He who believes and is baptized will be saved"'.¹⁵ Baptism, then, is necessary for salvation as is the Church, which one enters through Baptism; and imprints on the soul an indelible sign that consecrates the baptized person for Christian worship. Through Baptism in and by the Church one enters the mystery of God's love of us as well as the mystery of salvation. The particular grace that one receives at Baptism is known as sanctifying grace which

is an habitual gift, a stable and supernatural disposition that perfects the soul itself to enable it to live with God, to act by his love. *Habitual grace*, the permanent disposition to live and act in keeping with God's call, is distinguished from *actual graces* which refer to God's interventions, whether at the beginning of conversion or in the course of the work of sanctification.¹⁶

Sanctifying grace should not be seen as a thing but be regarded as a positive share in the life of God; one enters a relationship with God. The idea that God has taken account of our well-being with a favour that is infinite and that He loves us to the extent that He does is demonstrated by Christ's act of self-giving for our salvation and is totally new. So, according to the author of Hebrews, 'do not be led away by diverse and strange teachings; for it is well for that the heart be strengthened by grace, not by foods, which have not benefitted their adherents' (Heb. 13: 9). Grace, therefore, is the salvation announced by the prophets, which finds its fulfilment in the life that his sufferings have made possible for us and in the glory of Christ.

We have been justified by the grace of God won for us on Calvary. We have not merited this grace; we have been saved by the 'gratuitous favour of God' (see Eph. 2:8). 'With regard to God, there is no strict right to any merit on the part of man.

¹³ Robert W Gleason SJ, *Grace*, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1962) p. 39

¹⁴ CCC 1999

¹⁵ CCC 977

¹⁶ CCC 2000

Between God and us there is an immeasurable inequality, for we have received everything from him, our Creator'.¹⁷ Left to our own devices when we do not have a share in the divine life of God, we tend to stray from the divine will. Beginning with Adam, all attempts at saving oneself have met with failure. Although there have been a few faithful individuals, such as Abraham and Moses, the overwhelming evidence is that humanity do not remain faithful to the will of God and falls into sin. Thomas Aquinas teaches that 'because human nature is not altogether corrupted by sin, so as to be shorn of every natural good, even in the state of corrupted nature it can, by virtue of its natural endowments, work some particular good'.¹⁸ What Aquinas has in mind is that man can do and make good things but 'beyond this... man needs Divine help, that he may be moved to act well'.¹⁹ Left to his own devices, man 'by his nature cannot produce meritorious works proportionate to everlasting life; and for this a higher force is needed (namely) the force of grace'.²⁰ Therefore, in His mercy, God has given us the means of salvation, namely Christ, His only begotten Son. 'Since the initiative belongs to God in the order of grace, *no one can merit the initial grace* of forgiveness and justification, at the beginning of conversion. Moved by the Holy Spirit and by charity *we can then merit* for ourselves and for others the graces needed for the attainment of eternal life'.²¹ Indeed Saint John the Evangelist has given us an idea how this divine life might be retained. In the image of the vine, Jesus taught his apostles the necessity of being one with him and through him one with the Father. By sharing in the life of Christ one shares in the divine life of God. The branches that do not bear fruit are cut away; those that do are pruned. Having been cut away, one withers and dies because one is not supported by the grace of God through Christ; whereas those that do remain one with Christ bear fruit and through careful pruning will bear more (see Jn. 15: 1-11). From this it becomes clear that without the grace of Christ human beings can do nothing to advance themselves toward salvation.

In the mystery of salvation God has come to meet us and that grace makes us friends of God.²² Love is God's motivation and 'his desire is to set up in us a new universe of life, light and love, so that we may be able to make our way toward the

¹⁷ CCC 2007

¹⁸ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*: 'The Necessity of Grace' (Prima Secundae Partis, Q. 109, Article 2)

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid, Article 5

²¹ CCC 2010

²² Op. cit., Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 'Charity considered in itself', (SS, Q. 1)

depth of his being and intimacy with him, to speak to him as our friend'.²³ Illustrative of this is the parable of the Prodigal Son. Although the younger son had deserted his father, the father never abandoned him but rather, 'while he was yet at a distance, his father saw him and had compassion, and ran and embraced him and kissed him' (Lk. 15: 20). The important point in this parable is that God wants to treat us in the same way that the father "ran" to meet his son upon the son's return. The father's love and patience in the parable are so palpable that one can feel the love implicit in his compassion and forgiveness. Like the prodigal son, we are drawn into the supernatural love of God whose joy knows no boundaries. And, indeed, like the prodigal son, we have a choice to cooperate with the grace that God provides. In this cooperation, there are five effects of grace in a person: 'the first is to heal the soul; the second, to desire good; the third, to carry into effect the good proposed; the fourth, to preserve the good; and the fifth, to reach glory'.²⁴ Since grace is a share in divine life then this is the closest union that one can have with God as a human person. As John the Evangelist states, 'the Word became flesh' (Jn. 1:14) which implies that Christ is the concrete embodiment of the inner goodness and mercy of God towards us so that 'from his fullness have we all received, grace upon grace' (Jn. 1:16). So, when one does cooperate with God's grace this cooperation will bear fruit in one such as in good acts – as the Letter of James states, 'show me your faith apart from your works, and I by my works will show you my faith' (Jas. 2:18). In this context faith is necessary for grace and is dependent upon grace so that in this way one can show others what one believes by what one does.

Timelessness in the Roman Canon

At Mass, at the great prayer and act of thanksgiving, three different "times" intersect: sacred time with eternity and chronological time. Chronological time as one knows and experiences it moves forward and so one can have a sense of the past and the present but also, in a limited way, of the future – for example, one can make plans for the future in the present. We also have a sense of "time" that is eternal in that we can define it as something or someone always existing; that has always existed; without beginning or an end in time; God's "time" which is eternally now. Then there is sacred time, which in the context of the Roman Canon incorporates the time it takes to pray the

²³ Charles Journet, *The Meaning of Grace*, (Princeton, New Jersey: Scepter Publishers, 1996) p. 20

²⁴ Op. cit., *Summa Theologica*, Q. 111, Article 3

liturgy. This sacred time is set in chronological time and co-exists within chronological time but which operates on another dimension to chronological time. Whereas chronological time moves forward as does sacred time (in the context of the time it takes to celebrate Mass) but sacred time may also move independently of chronological time in that it is not necessarily influenced by what happens at that time in the world outside of the liturgy. The two times, sacred and chronological, move in parallel to each other; sacred time occurs in chronological time but it has its own timeframe and sacred space – the duration of the Mass. At Mass, which may take an hour or two of chronological time, there is a movement in prayer, posture and time that has a different pace and purpose to chronological time. The Mass – which is a participation in, and an anticipation of the great heavenly liturgy where the saints and the angels give praise to God – then, it is here that sacred time meets the eternal in chronological time.

The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, speaking of the Church as those who believe in Christ states that its members

are reborn, not from a corruptible seed, but from an incorruptible one through the word of the living God (cf. 1 Pet. 1:23), not from flesh, but from water and the Holy Spirit (cf. Jn. 3:5-6), are finally established as a “chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God’s own people... once you were no people, but now are God’s people” (1 Pet. 2:9-10)²⁵

Jesus Christ the Son of God has straddled time: in the eternal and chronological “times”, in the divine and human worlds in his Incarnation. And Christ as high priest leads us in the great prayer of Thanksgiving in particular, and the Mass in general, which are examples of the way that we respond to God’s initiative not only of his self-revelation but also of Christ’s self-immolation. Indicative of the timelessness of the liturgy that the Church celebrates, the translation of the text of the Mass and of the Roman Canon needs to convey what the community has been praying – *lex orandi... lex credendi*. In other words, we have a duty to follow Christ’s command to ‘love one another as I have loved you’ (Jn. 15: 12) and participate as best one can in the greatest act of that love, God’s self-giving of himself to us.

²⁵ Second Vatican Council. Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium*, (21 November 1964) §9 (Hereafter LG)

Participation of the Laity

As has been noted throughout this thesis, through an authentic translation from Latin into the English the faithful have the opportunity to obtain a heightened sense of the sacred. Reform of the liturgy of the Mass, then, has made possible a more active participation of the faithful in a number of different ways. Focussing on the Eucharistic Prayer only, the first opportunity for participation is in the opening dialogue before the Preface. Active participation consists in one fully, consciously and actively being involved in the action of that moment in the prayer being offered to God. Since the dialogue before the Preface is in the vernacular and because all those present take part in this dialogue, the opportunity for active participation is possible. In times past, when the priest performed the liturgical action and prayed the prayers, a server at the altar recited the responses in Latin on behalf of the congregation. Today, as the Mass is celebrated in the vernacular, all respond to the invocations, prayers and petitions acclaimed by the priest. The Eucharistic Prayer then, the great prayer of thanksgiving, is a prayer to the Father by the Son in the Spirit – as was noted in my two previous chapters, God is the focus of this liturgical act. Therefore, we listen with the ears of faith and with an open heart. Christ prays not only through the person of the priest but also through the congregation ‘who *together* represent Christ, the *whole* Christ, “head and body”’.²⁶

The dialogue before the Preface sets up the context of the Eucharistic Prayer as Christ’s prayer, then, ‘and we, fully, consciously, and actively, participate in it’.²⁷ The Preface concludes with the *Sanctus*, that great hymn of glory sung by the angels before the throne of God. It is fitting, therefore, that we, not only join the heavenly host in praising God but also, that we should join our voices to theirs and sing this hymn of praise to God. We the faithful participate through song.

At the end of the *Sanctus* the congregation kneels and a (holy) silence descends recalling that we are in the presence of Christ (in the person of the priest) who will proclaim Christ’s great prayer of thanksgiving to his Father. And because the Eucharistic prayer is in the vernacular, the faithful have the opportunity of more easily engaging in the Prayer with the priest through their silence. In this Prayer, through words and ritual, we participate in the “work of God” that Christ does. Throughout the prayer the faithful are silently engaged in the ritual of kneeling and listening, and

²⁶ Op. cit., *Sheer Grace*, p. 64

²⁷ Ibid.

appropriating to themselves that which is being prayed. In the first stage of the Eucharistic Prayer then, the transition from Preface to the text of the Eucharistic Prayer a change in posture is taken by the faithful – from standing for the Preface and the singing of the “*Sanctus*” to kneeling for the Eucharistic Prayer. In this first prayer of acceptance, we recall the gifts that were brought to the altar at the beginning of the Liturgy of the Eucharist with the *preparation of the altar and the gifts* stage of the Mass and noted, then, that the bread and wine themselves were God’s gifts to us and that we are now using these God-given gifts as our offerings to God at this point of the Eucharistic Prayer. We ask God to ‘accept and bless these gifts’.

At the first intercessions stage of the Prayer of the Roman Canon, we pray for the Church, the Pope, and bishop as well as for the living. At the stage of the first listing of the saints, we join our petitions with the voices of the saints and invoke their assistance for God’s ‘protecting help’. As we draw closer to the prayer of consecration, there is the first formula of offering, the “*Hanc igitur*”, where we pray that the Father, who is the focus of this liturgy, would ‘graciously accept this oblation of our service’ – we unite ourselves with the oblation that Christ offered his Father. The community ‘asks for God’s gracious acceptance of the gifts which at their preparation had become a symbol of God’s people in their self-giving’.²⁸ The first *epiclesis*, which follows, is closely associated with the previous prayer in that ‘God would indeed accept this sacrifice, for he alone can take the community, represented by its gifts, into the sacrifice of Christ’.²⁹ Calling to mind that human hands made this bread and wine, they represent our lives and indeed our very selves. At this point we ask God to ‘bless, acknowledge, and approve this offering’ of the bread and wine. Therefore, through the power of the Holy Spirit who is being called upon in this prayer to ‘make it spiritual and acceptable’ we pray that ‘this offering...may become the Body and Blood’ of Christ, which is accomplished at the consecration.

After the consecration the priest proclaims, ‘The mystery of faith’, which originates from 1 Timothy 3:9.³⁰ The point being made is that the mystery of faith – that is, that the Body and Blood of Christ, his one sacrifice – is here on this altar being

²⁸ Johannes H Emminghaus, *The Eucharist*, Essence, Form, Celebration, (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1978) p. 175

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ In the Latin texts previous to the use of the vernacular, the words for consecration over the chalice were: ‘*Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti: mysterium fidei: qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*’ and translates to: ‘For this is the Chalice of my Blood, the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith: which will be poured out for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins’.

offered to God. In response, the faithful acclaim: ‘We proclaim your Death, O Lord...’ or another of the three alternative acclamations on offer. What does this mean? Each of the acclamations professes some principle of the mystery of our salvation. As the act of consecration has brought the presence of the eternal Son of God into our midst, our response, in faith, is to affirm the mystery of our salvation. In the first ‘we proclaim’ which implies that we publically profess something to become widely known; ‘and to profess’, which implies that we affirm and declare one’s faith in and allegiance to a religious principle – in this case, the Death and Resurrection of our Lord. In the second acclamation, we proclaim that by partaking of the Bread and the Cup, we ‘proclaim the Death of our Lord’ – we are affirming in our response the mystery of salvation until he returns. In the third, we ask the Saviour of the world to save us.

As the Roman Canon unfolds with the *Unde et memores* prayer, we the faithful humbly pray for acceptance of the community in its gifts, which have become the Body and Blood of Christ. Mindful of God’s fidelity to his Chosen People, the community joins with Christ in praying for acceptance of its gifts: ‘the Church appeals to God’s fidelity and manner of acting with the patriarchs, Abel, Abraham, and Melchizedek, when they offered him sacrifices which he found pleasing because they represented an unconditional self-dedication’.³¹ On the other hand, there is an assurance that the sacrifice will be accepted because it is a memorial of the sacrifice of Christ whose ‘blood ... speaks more graciously than the blood of Abel’ (Heb. 12:24).

In the communion *epiclesis* (“*supplices te rogamus*”) prayer, the community prays through Christ, who is the Angel named, because he is ‘The “messenger” *par excellence* of the Father in word and sacrament – from the Father through Christ to men, and from the faithful through Christ back to the Father’.³² Following this, the prayer for the commemoration for the dead echoes the earlier prayer for the living where ‘in the manifold intercessions’, both before and after the consecration, ‘the emphasis is on the sacrifice of expiation for the community’.³³ In the second invocation of the saints, the community calls upon the saints to plead on our behalf before God and serves as a reminder that this Mass is not just happening in the here and now but is part of the eternal offering by Christ before the throne of God. Towards the end of the Eucharistic Prayer, the priest prays the great Trinitarian hymn of praise to

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid. p. 176

which the people acclaim the great “Amen” to denote their assent to what has been prayed. This is an important part of the Eucharistic prayer because it is an opportunity for the faithful to ratify, that which had proceeded and an authentic translation has the power to enhance the quality of the participation of the faithful.

In addition, it should be made clear that the word “participation” does not only refer to external activity by the faithful during the celebration of Mass but also includes a greater awareness by them of the mystery being celebrated. In faith we believe that by

Baptism men are grafted into the paschal mystery of Christ; they die with him, are buried with him, and rise with him (see Rom. 6:4). They receive the spirit of adoption as sons ‘when we cry Abba, Father’ (Rom. 8:15) and thus become true adorers such as the Father seeks (see Jn. 4:23).³⁴

Sacrosanctum Concilium specifies the spiritual dimension of the idea of participation by emphasising the conscious, active, and fruitful participation of the faithful with this: ‘in order that the liturgy may be able to produce its full effects, it is necessary that the faithful come to it with proper dispositions, that their minds should be attuned to their voices, and that they should cooperate with divine grace lest they receive it in vain’.³⁵ Participation, then ‘is demanded by the very nature of liturgy’³⁶ because liturgy is public worship, it implies that all present participate – each according to their office either through their ministerial priesthood bestowed on them by the Sacrament of Holy Orders or through the common priesthood of the faithful bestowed on all through the Sacrament of Baptism. Thus they participate according to their role in the priesthood of Christ.³⁷

This being the case, what is expected of each is that one becomes absorbed by Christ. ‘Active participation, thus, is not a giving way to any activism but an integral and total assimilation into the person of Christ who is truly the High Priest of that eternal and uninterrupted celebration of the heavenly liturgy’.³⁸ The *actio* in which we are called to participate is the very *actio* of Christ, continued by his Body, the Church³⁹ since it is the whole Church as the Mystical Body of Christ that presents the victim through Christ and his minister.⁴⁰ In order to render themselves suitable to participate

³⁴ SC §6

³⁵ SC §11

³⁶ Ibid. §14

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Malcolm Ranjith, ‘Towards an *Ars Celebrandi* in the Liturgy’, *Antiphon* 13 Issue 1 (2009), p. 9

³⁹ Op. cit., Aillet, p. 78

⁴⁰ see SC §7

in the paschal mystery then, the faithful should prepare themselves spiritually to enter into this mystery. ‘Since the mystery is present, it is necessary to be present to it!’⁴¹ An authentic translation has the possibility of bringing the faithful closer to that mystery.

Following on from this, ‘liturgical services are not private functions, but are celebrations of the Church, which is the “sacrament of unity”, namely, the holy people united under their bishops.’⁴² Here, the Church is understood to be the Mystical Body of Christ present in the faithful united around the table of the Lord with their priest. Christ is present in the person of the priest; in the assembled faithful; in the sacred scripture; as well as in the consecrated bread and wine that has become the Body and Blood of Christ.⁴³ So, the faithful deepen their participation in the Mystery of Salvation by opening themselves up to the reality in whose presence they are in and, as has been explained in my previous chapters, an authentic translation increases the probability of the faithful to enter into the mystery celebrated at Mass. The laity are able to deepen their participation in this mystery because the ‘faithful are called to take an active part in the liturgy; it is through the hands of the priest that they are able to do so’.⁴⁴ Participation in the liturgy is an exercise of faith and, therefore, is a theological action.

Liturgy, then, is an action of the entire community of the faithful and is defined as ‘an “action” of the *whole Christ (Christus totus)*’.⁴⁵ Those who even now celebrate it without signs are already in the heavenly liturgy, where celebration is wholly communion and feast’.⁴⁶ Communion, here, has a vertical sense as well as a horizontal sense: ‘it is communion with God and communion with our brothers and sisters’.⁴⁷ From this, whilst at Mass, it becomes obvious that we are celebrating and participating in something much bigger than ourselves; it is a celebration of the mystery of the presence of God. By preparing ourselves spiritually to participate in the paschal mystery we need to be properly disposed to obtain the full benefits of this participation: for, ‘it is in keeping with the very meaning of the Eucharist that the faithful, if they have the required dispositions, *receive communion when they participate in the Mass*’.⁴⁸

⁴¹ Op. cit., Aillet, p. 82

⁴² SC §26

⁴³ *ibid.* §7

⁴⁴ Op. Cit., Aillet, (p. 82)

⁴⁵ see CCC 1136

⁴⁶ see CCC 1136

⁴⁷ Benedict XVI, Post Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, §76

⁴⁸ CCC 1388

So, in order that there might be fruitful participation on the part of the faithful, there has to be a sense of as well as an actual practice of ‘constant conversion’. ‘Active participation in the Eucharistic liturgy can hardly be expected if one approaches it superficially, without an examination of his or her life’.⁴⁹ Therefore, we must be personally conformed to the mystery that we are celebrating.

This personal transformation that is in line with the mystery that we are celebrating has implications on the way that one lives one’s life. Being aware of the great mystery that one is celebrating will have an impact on one’s morality as well as in the way that one will commit oneself to others. Since the gift of the Eucharist is an act of love on the part of God through Christ, it should move one to extend that love to others in that: ‘by sharing in the sacrifice of the Cross, the Christian partakes in Christ’s self-giving love and is equipped and committed to live this same charity in all his thoughts and deeds’.⁵⁰ After all, it was Christ who gave us his commandment that we should love one another *as he has loved* us: that is not for selfish gain but rather, selflessly, for love of God (see Jn. 13:34). Finally, then, the celebration of the Eucharist makes sacramentally present the gifts of our crucified Lord and we have a responsibility to prepare ourselves spiritually not only to be conformed to who and what we are about to encounter; we also have a responsibility to be spiritually ready to fully participate in and accept the One who comes to us so that we are better able to fulfil our social commitments in Christ.

Participation: *Ars Celebrandi*

At this stage of the analysis, *ars celebrandi*, will be discussed as ‘the primary way to foster the participation of the People of God in the sacred rite is the proper celebration of the rite itself. The *ars celebrandi* is the best way to ensure their *actuosa participatio*’.⁵¹ In order for this active participation by the faithful, as discussed, to be effective there is an expectation that certain criteria for the spiritually uplifting celebration of the liturgy be met by priests. The foundation of true *ars celebrandi* is a deeply spiritual communion with Christ. Liturgy with its rites and rituals, like any repetitive act has the possibility of falling into a routine – a habit – something one does with little forethought and preparation. This routine has two traps: the liturgy in the

⁴⁹ Op. cit., *Sacramentum Caritatis*, §55

⁵⁰ Ibid. §82

⁵¹ Ibid. §38

routine of the priest's day, and the routine nature of the celebration of the Mass. In the first understanding of "routine" the temptation is to arrive moments before the scheduled start of Mass and enter during the entrance hymn. In a priest's busy life and the number of demands that may be placed on his time, it may happen, occasionally; but he ought to make time to pray and enter into the great mystery at which he is about to preside. 'There can be no true *ars celebrandi* unless every priest is, first and foremost, touched and profoundly motivated by his faith in the Lord and in the grandeur of the tasks the Lord entrusts to him'.⁵² This spiritual interior disposition flows into his attitude towards the way he prays the Liturgy of the Eucharist, including in the way that he recites the Eucharistic Prayer – following the punctuation stops with an appropriate pause for each. If he allows the rite and rituals of the Mass to become a routine he risks devaluing the liturgical action not only for himself but also for the faithful. It becomes devalued for himself because he risks losing sight of the fact that he stands there *in persona Christi* and *he* may become the focus and centre of attention in the liturgical action. It also becomes devalued for the faithful because the routine nature of the Mass that he has conveyed will be noticed by his flock and they will lose the connection between the sacred mystery offered by Christ to the Father and what they are experiencing at this (routine) Mass.

In celebrating the Church's liturgy, the priest is to be attentive to the norms of celebrating the Mass. *Sacramentum Caritatis* taught that by 'emphasizing the importance of the *ars celebrandi* also leads to an appreciation of the value of the liturgical norms'.⁵³ Liturgy belongs to the Church and it has been given to the Church by Christ at the Last Supper when he commanded his apostles, 'do this in remembrance of me' (Lk. 22:20). This being the case, in line with *lex orandi... lex credendi*, the Church has a responsibility to ensure that its liturgical celebrations are in keeping with what it has been given by Christ and how this legacy has been handed down through Tradition over the centuries so, 'for its deeply divine and strongly ecclesial nature, the liturgy cannot be arbitrarily changed'.⁵⁴ When the Church prays, it is not only those present at Mass that pray; it is the whole Christ, Head and members of the Mystical Body of Christ – including the Church Victorious, the Church Militant, and the Church Suffering. Since the liturgy has been given to the Church by Christ, 'the correct *ars*

⁵² Op. cit., Malcolm Ranjith, p. 10

⁵³ Op. cit., *Sacramentum Caritatis*, §40

⁵⁴ Op. cit., Ranjith, p. 14

celebrandi for priests would be to ensure that they allow Christ to take over at the altar, becoming his voice, his hands, his very being – *alter Christus*'.⁵⁵ As the priest stands before the altar *in persona Christi* he needs to be mindful of how he says what he says and what he does because they are not his words and actions but those of Christ's. Therefore, 'the *ars celebrandi* involves the "faithful adherence to the liturgical norms in all their richness"'.⁵⁶

Finally, priests have a duty to pray the Mass devoutly. According to *Sacramentum Caritatis*, 'in virtue of his reception of Holy Orders, (the priest) represents Jesus Christ, the head of the Church, and, in a specific way, also the Church herself'.⁵⁷ As such, priests have a responsibility 'to celebrate the sacred liturgy devoutly and faithfully, in absolute fidelity to the norms and requirements'⁵⁸ of the Church. Hence, in relation to what I have been arguing in this thesis, the translation of the words of the Eucharistic Prayer are important because what we pray is an expression of what we believe – *lex orandi...lex credendi*. Celebrants of the Mass owe it to themselves as well as to their congregation that they do not draw attention to themselves because that would betray the real focus of the liturgy, Christ himself, but 'by submitting humbly to the beauty of the rubrics, he will be freer to elevate his mind and heart to the contemplation of the mysteries he celebrates and be able to adore the Lord and the heavenly hosts that descend on the altar, transmitting that same faith and devotion to his congregation'.⁵⁹ Therefore, I would suggest that *ars celebrandi* and *actuosa participatio* come together in the way that the priest celebrates Mass.

The Magisterium and *Ars Celebrandi*

Mindful of its responsibilities to celebrate with dignity and respect the sacred mysteries that Christ left the Church in the liturgy of the Eucharist, the Magisterium has taken great care to articulate, in the words of the Roman Canon, what is being celebrated and how this is to be carried out. In order to appreciate the detail with which the Church attends to its liturgy, five texts will be examined to comprehend the significance of the changes in the First Eucharistic Prayer and explain what were the implications of those changes. The texts that form the basis of this discussion include

⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 12

⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 14

⁵⁷ Op. cit., *Sacramentum Caritatis*, §53

⁵⁸ Op. cit., Ranjith, p. 15

⁵⁹ Ibid.

the International Commission on English in the Liturgy's (ICEL) text of 2008 submitted to Rome, the "Recognitio" Text, the "Received" Text, the "Issued" Text from ICEL of 2010.⁶⁰ Points of difference in these texts will now be examined in some detail.

In the Transition Prayer (*Te igitur*), the first changes in the text are minor ones.

Latin Text	ICEL 2008 Text	Recognitio Text	Received Text	ICEL Issued Text
Te igitur, clementissimi me Pater, per Iesum Christum, Filius tuum, Dominum nostrum, supplices rogamus, ac petimus, uti accepta habeas et benedicas, haec dona haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia illibata, in primis, quae tibi offerimus pro Ecclesia tua sancta catholica:	To you, therefore, most merciful Father, we make humble prayer and petition through Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord: He joins his hands and says that you accept He makes the Sign of the Cross once over the bread and chalice together, saying: and bless	To you, therefore, most merciful Father, we make humble prayer and petition through Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord: Rejoins his hands and says: That you accept He makes the Sign of the Cross once over the bread and chalice together, saying: and bless	To you, therefore, most merciful Father, we make humble prayer and petition through Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord: He joins his hands and says: that you accept He makes the Sign of the Cross once over the bread and chalice together, saying: and bless	To you, therefore, most merciful Father, we make humble prayer and petition through Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord: He joins his hands and says: that you accept He makes the Sign of the Cross once over the bread and chalice together, saying: and bless

⁶⁰ These texts were provided by Edmund Yates of the International Commission on English in the Liturgy. The text of the E-mail, dated Wednesday 3 April 2013 is: 'Following the 2008 text, there were several versions of the manuscript before the published editions began to be sold in 2011 in time for the First Sunday of Advent, when most of the ICEL Conferences implemented the new Roman Missal in their territories. The versions are:

Recognitio text
Received text
ICEL December 2010 text
ICEL Final text

You mentioned "texts that ICEL debated and from Vox Clara..." I would like to clarify the providence of the attached texts. The Recognitio text is a scan from the book presented to the Pope when the recognition was announced in April 2010. The Received text is the text that the Conferences received from the Congregation in August 2010 and passed on to ICEL. Between August and December, ICEL corresponded with the Congregation on particular points of consistency in the manuscript and just before the Christmas break issued the manuscript to the Conferences of Bishops. In the next six months, 8 separate errata – more points of internal inconsistency – were issued by ICEL to the Conferences and at the conclusion of the process a new ICEL final text with music was re-issued to the Conferences in April 2012.

There was no direct communication between ICEL and Vox Clara in the above time period.'

✠	✠	✠	✠
these gifts, these offerings, these holy and unblemishe d sacrifices.	these gifts, these offerings, these holy and unblemishe d sacrifices.	these gifts, these offerings, these holy and unblemishe d sacrifices,	these gifts, these offerings, these holy and unblemishe d sacrifices,
With hands extended, he continues:	With hands extended, he continues:	With hands extended, he continues:	With hands extended, he continues:
which we offer you first of all for your holy catholic Church.	which we offer you firstly for your holy catholic Church.	which we offer you firstly for your holy catholic Church.	which we offer you firstly for your holy catholic Church.

In the “Recognitio” text, there is a colon after the word ‘Lord’ followed by a capital letter, for the word “That”, whereas in the 2008 International Commission on English in the Liturgy⁶¹ text, “that” was in lower case. Grammatically, there does not need to be a capital letter when the subsequent idea expressed is a continuation of the first; and the subsequent texts returned to the use of lower case. Secondly, the rubric, ‘He joins his hands...’ in the 2008 text was changed to ‘rejoins’ when this is the first time that the priest joins his hands in this prayer; so, on a point of consistency, the original terminology was returned in subsequent texts. Thirdly, the full stop at the end of the prayer (unblemished sacrifices) was retained in the “Recognitio” text from 2008, but this punctuation mark was replaced by a comma in the “Received” text and subsequently retained, which is also consistent with the Latin text of the Third Typical Edition. The use of the comma suggests continuation of the same idea. Finally, the phrase, ‘first of all’ used in the 2008 text was replaced by the adverb, ‘firstly’ in the “Recognitio” text and retained by each of the subsequent texts.

The next text to be discussed concerns the prayer for the commemoration of the living.

Latin Text	ICEL 2008 Text	Recognitio Text	Received Text	ICEL Issued Text
Memento,	Remember,	Remember,	Remember,	Remember,

⁶¹ The International Commission on English in the Liturgy will be referred to as ICEL throughout the thesis

Domine,
famulorum
famularumque
tuarum N. et N.
et omnium
circumstantium,
quorum tibi
fides cognita
est et nota
devotio, pro
quibus tibi
offerimus: vel
qui tibi offerunt
hoc sacrificium
laudis, pro se
suisque
omnibus: pro
redemptione
animarum
suarum, pro spe
salutis et
incolumitatis
suae: tibi que
reddunt vota
sua aeterno
Deo, vivo et
vero.

Lord, your
servants N.
and N.

The Priest
joins his
hands and
prays briefly
for those for
whom he
intends to
pray.

Then, with
hands
extended, he
continues:

and all
gathered
here,
whose faith
and
devotion are
known to
you.
For them
and all who
are dear to
them
we offer you
this sacrifice
of praise
or they offer
it for
themselves
and all who
are dear to
them,
for the
redemption
of their
souls,
in hope of
health and
well-being,
and
fulfilling
their vows
to you,
the eternal
God, living
and true.

Lord, your
servants N.
and N.

The Priest
joins his
hands and
prays
briefly for
those for
whom he
intends to
pray.

Then, with
hands
extended,
he
continues:

and all
gathered
here,
whose faith
and
devotion
are known
to you.
For them
and all who
are dear to
them
we offer
you this
sacrifice of
praise
or they
offer it for
themselves
and all who
are dear to
them,
for the
redemption
of their
souls,
in hope of
health and
well-being,
and paying
their
homage to
you,
the eternal
God, living
and true.

Lord, your
servants N.
and N.

The Priest
joins his
hands and
prays
briefly for
those for
whom he
intends to
pray.

Then, with
hands
extended,
he
continues:

and all
gathered
here,
whose faith
and
devotion
are known
to you.
For them,
we offer
you this
sacrifice of
praise or
they offer
it for
themselves
and all who
are dear to
them,
for the
redemption
of their
souls,
in hope of
health and
well-being,
and paying
their
homage to
you,
the eternal
God, living
and true.

Lord, your
servants N.
and N.

The Priest
joins his
hands and
prays briefly
for those for
whom he
intends to
pray.

Then, with
hands
extended, he
continues:

and all
gathered
here,
whose faith
and devotion
are known to
you.
For them, we
offer you
this sacrifice
of praise or
they offer it
for
themselves
and all who
are dear to
them:
for the
redemption
of their
souls,
in hope of
health and
well-being,
and paying
their homage
to you,
the eternal
God, living
and true.

After the 2008 text was returned, the “Recognitio” text had the words ‘fulfilling’ changed to ‘paying’; and ‘vows’ changed to ‘homage’. In this editing there is a change

of orientation: in fulfilling something, one is adhering to a promise and suggests an obligation, in this case promises made in the form of a vow. By inserting ‘paying homage’ suggests a relationship – between creature and creator: we owe God so much for his graciousness and for the benefits he has given that it is appropriate that in this Prayer of Thanksgiving, that we should worship him. The second change occurred in the phrasing of ‘for them and all who are dear to them’. The “Recognitio” text followed the lead set in the 2008 text but it was not until the “Received” text from Rome that this change was noted. As it stood in the previous two texts, the idea was complicated by the repetition of ‘and all who are dear to them’ so, a comma was inserted after ‘for them’ at the beginning of the prayer but the comma at the end of the change ‘dear to them’ was retained. This had the effect of placing the change into parenthesis, which created an ambiguity. Therefore, after discussions between ICEL and Rome, a colon was inserted after ‘and all who are dear to them’ in the “Issued” text (which was in the Latin text of the Third Typical Edition) and which was disseminated to the Bishops’ Conferences for their comment on the changes in the text. The effect of the colon was that it included the subsequent ideas as a listing adding to the original idea of the prayer, which was a commemoration of the living. The changes were approved and have been included in the final text.

In the *Communicantes* prayer that follows this prayer, there are a few changes of note.

Latin Text	ICEL 2008 Text	Recognitio Text	Received Text	ICEL Issued Text
Communicantes, et memoriam venerantes, in primis gloriosae semper Virginis Mariae, Genetricis Dei et Domini nostri Iesu Christi: sed et beati Ioseph, eiusdem Virginis Sponsi, et beatorum Apostolorum ac Martyrum tuorum, Petri et	In communion with those whose memory we venerate, especially the glorious ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ, † and	In communion with those whose memory we venerate, especially the glorious ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ, † and	In communion with those whose memory we venerate, especially the glorious ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ, † and	In communion with those whose memory we venerate, especially the glorious ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ, † and

Pauli, Andreae, (Iacobi, Ioannis, Thomae, Iacobi, Philippi, Bartholomaei, Matthaei, Simonis et Thaddaei: Lini, Cleti, Clementis, Xysti, Cornelii, Cypriani, Laurentii, Chrysogoni, Ioannis et Pauli, Cosmae et Damiani) et omnium Sanctorum tuorum; quorum meritis precibusque concedas, ut in omnibus protectionis tuae muniamur auxilio. (Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.)	blessed Joseph, Spouse of the same Virgin, your blessed Apostles and Martyrs, ... Matthew, Simon and Jude: Linus, Cletus, Clement, Sixtus, ... and all your Saints; through their merits and prayers grant that in all things we may be defended by your protecting help. (Through Christ our Lord. Amen.)	blessed Joseph, her Spouse, your blessed Apostles and Martyrs, ... Matthew, Simon and Jude: Linus, Cletus, Clement, Sixtus, ... and all your Saints; we ask that through their merits and prayers in all things we may be defended by your protecting help. (Through Christ our Lord. Amen.)	blessed Joseph, her Spouse, your blessed Apostles and Martyrs, ... Matthew, Simon and Jude: Linus, Cletus, Clement, Sixtus, ... and all your Saints: we ask that through their merits and prayers in all things we may be defended by your protecting help. (Through Christ our Lord. Amen.)	blessed Joseph, her Spouse, your blessed Apostles and Martyrs, ... Matthew, Simon and Jude: Linus, Cletus, Clement, Sixtus, ... and all your Saints; we ask that through their merits and prayers in all things we may be defended by your protecting help. (Through Christ our Lord. Amen.)
--	--	---	---	---

The first of the changes refers to the phrase ‘of the same Virgin’ which was part of the ICEL 2008 text; but was removed in the “Recognitio” text sent to Rome for approval in April 2010. The phrase was replaced by the possessive pronoun ‘her’ to personalise the relationship between Mary and Saint Joseph as well as to avoid the repetition of the fact that Mary was a virgin, a point established earlier in the sentence: ‘the glorious ever-Virgin’. This change was subsequently retained in the following texts. Secondly, the colon after ‘Jude’ was inserted in the ICEL text of 2008. It was retained in the “Recognitio” and “Received” texts suggesting approval for its use. However, following further discussions between Rome and ICEL on matters of consistency in the text, the colon was changed to a semi-colon in the “Issued” text, which was sent to the Bishops’ Conferences for comment and approval – this change was approved and retained in the

final text. The force of the change is that when using a colon one is suggesting a listing, which occurs with the names of the saints that follow.⁶²

The third change refers to the insertion of the phrase ‘we ask that’ in the prayer towards the end of this prayer. These words were inserted in the “Recognitio” text sent to Rome in April 2010 and were retained in each of the following texts. At the same time, the words, ‘grant that’ were removed from the ICEL 2008 text in the same “Recognitio” text. The effect of this double change is to retain the sense of humility that has been established in the Eucharistic Prayer: ‘grant that’ implies making a demand of God whereas in the words, ‘we ask that’ suggests we are making a request. This is a subtle change but an important one if one is to maintain a consistent prayerfulness throughout the prayer and when the overall attitude in the relationship of mankind to God is that of humility. This change was approved and subsequently retained in the following texts.

At the prayer of consecration, there a couple of important changes to the text.

Latin Text	ICEL 2008 Text	Recognitio Text	Received Text	ICEL Issued Text
Qui, pridie quam pateretur, accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas, et elevatis oculis in caelum ad te Deum, Patrem suum omnipotentem, tibi gratias agens benedixit, fregit, deditque discipulis suis, dicens:	On the day before he was to suffer The Priest takes the bread and, holding it slightly raised above the altar, continues: he took bread in his holy and venerable hands, He raises his eyes. and with eyes raised to heaven to you, O God, his	On the day before he was to suffer, The Priest takes the bread and, holding it slightly raised above the altar, continues: he took bread in his holy and venerable hands, He raises his eyes. with eyes raised to heaven to you, O God, his	On the day before he was to suffer, The Priest takes the bread and, holding it slightly raised above the altar, continues: he took bread in his holy and venerable hands, He raises his eyes. and with eyes raised to heaven to you, O God, his	On the day before he was to suffer, The Priest takes the bread and, holding it slightly raised above the altar, continues: he took bread in his holy and venerable hands, He raises his eyes. and with eyes raised to heaven to you, O God, his

⁶² John Eastwood, *Oxford Guide to English Grammar*, № 56 (3 f)

almighty
Father,
giving you
thanks he
said the
blessing,
broke the
bread
and gave
it to his
disciples,
saying:

giving you
thanks he
said the
blessing,
broke the
bread
and gave it
to his
disciples,
saying:

almighty
Father,
giving you
thanks he
said the
blessing,
broke the
bread
and gave
it to his
disciples,
saying:

almighty
Father,
giving you
thanks, he
said the
blessing,
broke the
bread
and gave
it to his
disciples,
saying:

The word “and” was part of the Latin text of the Third Typical Edition and was included in the ICEL text of 2008 with, ‘and with eyes raised to heaven’; it was removed from the “Recognitio” text, but it was re-inserted by Rome in the “Received” text. The removal of the word ‘and’ gives the impression that the action of the first idea, ‘he took bread...’ with the action of ‘raising his eyes’⁶³ are part of the same action when, clearly, there are two actions involved in this process. By re-inserting the word ‘and’ in the “Received” text would suggest that Rome agreed with the 2008 ICEL text as well as with the Latin text of the Third Typical Edition, interpreting the action as a development; and the use of “and” is understood to be as a conjunction. The second change involves the imposition of a comma after the phrase ‘giving you thanks’. The 2008 ICEL text and the “Recognitio” and “Received” texts there was no comma; after discussions between Rome and ICEL on points of consistency in the text, a comma was inserted in the “Issued” text in December 2010 for comment by the Conferences of Bishops.

The purpose of the comma between the phrases ‘giving you thanks’ and ‘he said the blessing’ suggests there is a listing of actions as well as a break in the action of the event that is unfolding. There is a listing as there is reference made to a number of actions; and without the comma, there is a unity pronounced that is not borne out by the syntax of the sentence. There is a natural pause after ‘giving you thanks’, which is enhanced by the insertion of the comma, thereby separating the two actions. It also has the added effect of placing the idea of ‘giving you thanks’ in parenthesis with the main actions of ‘taking bread’, ‘raising his eyes to God’ and ‘saying the blessing’. The momentum of the action is propelled with the use of the participle “giving” – which is both in the Latin text as well as in the English translation – being used as a conjunction thereby indicating continuity to the development of the sentiments of this prayer. These

⁶³ *elevates*, as noted earlier in the thesis, is an ablative absolute – meaning “with eyes raised to heaven”

alterations were then sent to the Bishops' Conferences and since they are part of the Final text would suggest that the changes were confirmed.

In the second formula of offering, in the prayer: "*Supra quae propitio*" again, a couple of changes are noted.

Latin Text	ICEL 2008 Text	Recognitio Text	Received Text	ICEL Issued Text
Supra quae propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris: et accepta habere, sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui iusti Abel, et sacrificium Patriarchae nostri Abrahae, et quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos tuus Melchisedech, sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam.	Be pleased to look upon them with serene and kindly countenance, and to accept them, as you were pleased to accept the gifts of your servant Abel the just, the sacrifice of Abraham, our father in faith, and the offering of your high priest Melchizedek, a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim.	Be pleased to look upon these offerings With a serene and kindly countenance, and to accept them, as once you were pleased to accept the gifts of your servant Abel the just, the sacrifice of Abraham, our father in faith, and the offering of your high priest Melchizedek, a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim.	Be pleased to look upon these offerings with a serene and kindly countenance, and to accept them, as once you were pleased to accept the gifts of your servant Abel the just, the sacrifice of Abraham, our father in faith, and the offering of your high priest Melchizedek, a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim.	Be pleased to look upon these offerings with a serene and kindly countenance, and to accept them, as once you were pleased to accept the gifts of your servant Abel the just, the sacrifice of Abraham, our father in faith, and the offering of your high priest Melchizedek, a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim.

The words, 'these offerings' in the "Recognitio" text replaced the word 'them', which was introduced in the ICEL text of 2008. In this case 'them' refers to 'the Bread of life and the Chalice of everlasting salvation' mentioned at the end of the preceding prayer. The use of 'them' could be construed as being impersonal, especially in the light of the fact that reference is being made to the Divine Presence. Therefore, by changing 'them' to 'these offerings', suitable cognizance is being made about the real presence of God. The changes were sent to Rome for approval and since they were retained in the

“Received” text; the insertion was passed onto the other texts. The second change included the addition of the indefinite article, ‘a’ to the 2008 ICEL text – first inserted in the “Recognitio” text. It would seem that its inclusion is grammatical because in English one needs an article in this situation. However, the insertion of the word ‘once’ does have other ramifications. The word was not used in the 2008 ICEL text but was used for the first time in the “Recognitio” text suggesting that at a particular point in time, God was pleased to accept the gift made by Abel. ‘Once’ implies on one occasion referring to an offering by Abel but in this instance, because of the verbs “*accepta*”, “*dignatus es*”, and “*obtulit*” are in the perfect tense and refer to an action completed with a perduring effect in the present. This is why “once” is a good translation. These changes were adopted in the subsequent texts.

Also, in the “*Supplices te rogamus*” prayer, there are a couple of alterations to the text.

Latin Text	ICEL 2008 Text	Recognitio Text	Received Text	ICEL Issued Text
Supplices te rogamus, omnipotens Deus: iube haec perferri per manus sancti Angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, in conspectu divinae maiestatis tuae: ut, quotquot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum Filii tui Corpus et Sanguinem sumpserimus, omni benedictione caelesti et gratia repleamur.	In humble prayer we ask you, almighty God, command that these gifts be borne by the hands of your holy Angel to your altar on high in the sight of your divine majesty, so that all of us who through this participation at the altar receive the most holy Body and Blood of your Son	In humble prayer we ask you, almighty God: command that these gifts be borne by the hands of your holy Angel to your altar on high in the sight of your divine majesty, so that all of us who through this participation at the altar receive the most holy Body and Blood of your Son	In humble prayer we ask you, almighty God: command that these gifts be borne by the hands of your holy Angel to your altar on high in the sight of your divine majesty, so that all of us who through this participation at the altar receive the most holy Body and Blood of your Son,	In humble prayer we ask you, almighty God: command that these gifts be borne by the hands of your holy Angel to your altar on high in the sight of your divine majesty, so that all of us, who through this participation at the altar receive the most holy Body and Blood of your Son,

In the ICEL text of 2008, there was a comma after ‘almighty God’, which was replaced by a colon in the “Recognitio” text. The use of the colon changes the sense of what is being conveyed. As mentioned above, the comma is used to denote the least discontinuity of grammatical construction and, in the way that it was used in the ICEL 2008 text, it also had the effect of separating groups of ideas. This is not the sense, and therefore, not the intention of the text. Because there is a listing that follows, a colon is the more appropriate form of punctuation to be used. Following its insertion in the “Recognitio” text, it was accepted and inserted in subsequent texts.

The other change referred to the use of a set of commas. In the ICEL 2008 text as well as in the “Recognitio” text there was no comma after the word ‘us’ and ‘Son’ in the clause, ‘who through his participation at the altar receive the most holy Body and Blood of your Son’. It was not until the “Issued” text both commas were included. The absence of the comma after the word ‘Son’ would suggest a continuation of the idea expressed in this line and with that expressed in the following line and, it would also suggest no pause in the enunciation of this part of the prayer. The comma was first inserted in the “Received” text, which suggests that Rome deemed it appropriate to separate the idea and to have a pause as stipulated by the rubrics. It was not until the “Issued” text, probably after discussions with Rome between August and December of the Year 2010, between the “Received” and “Issued” texts that the second comma was inserted after the word ‘us’. This change had the effect of placing the clause beginning with, ‘who through this participation...’ in parenthesis. This change was retained in the final text.

In the prayer for the commemoration of the dead, there were a number of changes to the prayer.

Latin Text	ICEL 2008 Text	Recognitio Text	Received Text	ICEL Issued Text
Nobis quoque peccatoribus famulis tuis, de multitudine miserationum tuarum sperantibus, partem aliquam et	To us, also, your sinful servants, And, with hands extended, he continues: who hope	To us, also, your servants, who, though sinners, And, with hands extended, he	To us, also, your servants, who, though sinners, And, with hands extended, he	To us, also, your servants, who, though sinners, And, with hands extended, he

societatem donare digneris, cum tuis sanctis Apostolis et Martyribus: cum Ioanne, Stephano, Matthia, Barnaba, (Ignatio, Alexandro, Marcellino, Petro, Felicitate, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucia, Agnete, Caecilia, Anastasia) et omnibus Sanctis tuis: intra quorum nos consortium, non aestimator meriti, sed veniae, quaesumus, largitor admitte. [Per Christum, Dominum nostrum.]	in your abundant mercies, ... with your holy Apostles and Martyrs: with John the Baptist, ... and all your Saints: admit us, you, into their company, not weighing our merits, but granting us your pardon, He joins his hands. through Christ our Lord.	continues: who hope in your abundant mercies, ... with your holy Apostles and Martyrs: with John the Baptist, ... and all your Saints: admit us, we beseech you, into their company, not weighing our merits, but granting us your pardon. He joins his hands. Through Christ our Lord.	continues: who hope in your abundant mercies, ... with your holy Apostles and Martyrs: with John the Baptist, ... and all your Saints: admit us, we beseech you, into their company, not weighing our merits, but granting us your pardon, He joins his hands. through Christ our Lord.	continues: who hope in your abundant mercies, ... with your holy Apostles and Martyrs: with John the Baptist, ... and all your Saints; admit us, we beseech you, into their company, not weighing our merits, but granting us your pardon, He joins his hands. through Christ our Lord.
---	---	---	--	--

The first of these changes was the deletion of the word ‘sinful’ from the phrase ‘your sinful servants’ and the text of the prayer was changed with the insertion of ‘who, though sinners’ to slightly alter the nuance of the message stated. In this change, some of the harshness of ‘sinful servants’ was removed in the new phrasing of ‘though sinners’, without losing the essence of the meaning conveyed. In general terms, the implication of “sinful” is that someone is full of sin – hardly the condition with which one should approach reception of the Lord’s Body and Blood – whereas, the idea underpinning ‘though sinners’ suggests that one is prone to sin but, hopefully, not in a mortal state of sin where one would be precluded from the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ. The subtle change is in the reminder that we are prone to sin but not necessarily sinful.

The second change concerns the use of the colon after the word ‘Saints’. In the ICEL text of 2008, a colon was inserted, which suggests a listing of pleas and

conditions; and the colon was retained in the “Recognitio” text and passed over by Rome in the “Received” text. However, between the “Received” text of August 2010 and the “Issued” text of December 2010, there would appear to have been a discussion regarding text changes for the “Issued” text because a semi-colon replaced the colon. Although the Latin text has a colon, in the English context a colon indicates a discontinuity of grammatical construction that is less than a full stop, while still retaining its property of making a listing. However, the semi-colon softens the force and effect of the colon and still retains the property of opening a listing. This change was inserted in the “Issued” text and has been retained in subsequent texts.

Thirdly, the word ‘beg’, used in the ICEL 2008 text was changed to ‘beseech’ in the “Recognitio” text. The word ‘beg’ suggests asking for something from someone in an earnest and humble manner; whereas the word ‘beseech’ retains the idea of earnestness in one’s entreaty and has the added quality of imploring – that is, uttering a prayer in supplication. Although subtle, these are important differences and in a gentle way change the dynamics of the prayer. Finally, there was a change in the punctuation towards the end of the prayer. Where, in the ICEL 2008 text, there was a comma after the word “pardon” this was changed in the “Recognitio” text to a full stop and the following word ‘through’, as a consequence, was spelt with a capital ‘T’. This retained the idea of consistency where the individual prayers ended with: ‘Through Christ our Lord’ but in this case without the parenthesis. Subsequently, Rome sent the “Received” text to ICEL with the comma after the word ‘pardon’ re-instated and the word ‘through’ without a capital letter. The effect of this change was to continue the idea of the content of the prayer by making this prayer ‘through Christ our Lord’. There was not an option offered as in the other prayers where the plea was inserted in parenthesis; here the plea is part of the invocation. These changes, too, were submitted to the Bishops’ Conferences for approval and, as noted in footnote 60 of this chapter, they would appear to have been incorporated in the final text.

Concluding Remarks

Although some of these changes in the Roman Canon are minor in comparison to others, it demonstrates the Church’s attention to detail and consistency in making sacred the experience of the faithful in order for them to participate effectively in this great prayer of thanksgiving at Mass. ‘According to the formula *lex orandi, lex*

credendi, the Church's liturgical rite will always be a reflection of her faith'.⁶⁴ When a Church's liturgical rite, in this case the Mass and in particular, the Roman Canon, has not been translated accurately, then this will have an impact on what one prays and what one believes. As noted in the Introductory Chapter, the Church's teaching is articulated and made manifest in the celebration of the liturgy. Indeed, Pope Saint John Paul II spoke of the Mass in terms of Eucharistic wonder.⁶⁵ With a similar sense of amazement and, indeed of sacred fear – similar to that fear and amazement that gripped Moses before the burning bush – we are drawn into a unique and new experience of God through the Eucharistic celebration.

Like Moses before the burning bush, we are invited to this Eucharistic wonder of which Pope John Paul II talked and which is made up of infinite respect. If God is present in the Eucharist, then we should first of all be filled with a feeling of fear: only God can take the initiative and bring himself near, right to the point of inviting us to enter into his intimacy.⁶⁶

Therefore, in order for the faithful to obtain the graces that flow through the Eucharistic celebration, all, including the Magisterium in providing the faithful with a sacred and meaningful experience of liturgy for them to access these graces; it includes a responsibility on the part of the priest to prepare himself for the sacred mysteries over which he is privileged to preside; and the faithful have a responsibility to place themselves in the proper disposition to receive these graces.

This brings the discussion back to the matter of 'grace', 'merit' and 'justification' that had been broached at the beginning of this chapter. As we have been justified by the grace won by Christ for us on Calvary, the Mass, especially the Eucharistic Prayer – the Roman Canon – commemorates this saving event. God's overture towards us is love; our response is praise and thanksgiving (*Eucharistia*) freely given. 'God's free initiative demands *man's free response*'.⁶⁷ What value would man's response be if it were not freely given? Participating with Christ in the Eucharistic celebration, then, is both an act of faith and an incredible gift. We did not merit such grace, which is 'first and foremost the gift of the Spirit who justifies and sanctifies us'.⁶⁸ In fact, because of our sinfulness, we deserve justice – God's justice – as sin is an offence against God in that we have chosen to disobey God and, consequently, justice

⁶⁴ Op. cit., Aillet, p. 40

⁶⁵ John Paul II, Encyclical Letter, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, §6

⁶⁶ Ibid. pp. 70-71

⁶⁷ CCC 2002

⁶⁸ CCC 2003

would demand that we be punished for, as Saint Paul states: ‘the wages of sin is death’ (Rom 6: 23). However, in order to demonstrate God’s immeasurable love and compassion, ‘when the time had fully come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons’ (Gal 4: 4). Therefore, while we were still sinners God showed how much he loved us by sending his only Son to make reparation for our sins and the Roman Canon celebrates this act of love. Imperative in understanding this act of love, I have argued that an authentic translation of the Roman Canon is important as it has an impact on what we say we believe in what we pray.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

Transformed in Christ

What I have been arguing throughout this thesis is that if the Roman Canon were not translated accurately and authentically, then the implication is that this would have a distorting affect on what we as a Church proclaim when we pray. *Lex orandi* communicates what the Church believes *lex credendi* – that is, what we believe is conveyed in what we pray. The translation of the Roman Canon then assumes an importance of vital proportions because it is *the* prayer of thanksgiving by Christ the High Priest before God. This thesis has critiqued language, grammar, punctuation and syntax in order to reach a deeper understanding of the theological implications applicable to an accurate and authentic translation of what the Church prayed for centuries in the Roman Canon in Latin by examining the translations made available in the 1974 and 2010 of the relevant *editio typica*. The thesis has also conveyed that through the translation of the Roman Canon, there are differences in the understanding of God expressed in those two translations and of the relationship of man to God inherent in each translation.

When the celebrant (or deacon) intones, ‘*ite missa est*’ at the end of Mass we are sent transformed in Christ by word and sacrament. During Mass the word of God has been proclaimed and broken open for the faithful; and those with the appropriate disposition have also received God in Holy Communion and thus transformed are ready to be Christ in the community. The reception of Communion is a testament to the love of God, of the relationship that exists between God and man and of the unity of mankind. For, when we profess one faith in Christ and in that belief receive the Body and Blood of Christ we thereby become transformed in Christ – one becomes another Christ in the world.

As noted in this thesis, in the Roman Canon after the Consecration the celebrant prays, ‘we, your servants and your holy people, offer to your glorious majesty from the gifts that you have given us, this pure victim, this holy victim, this spotless victim, the holy Bread of eternal life and the Chalice of everlasting salvation’.

Christ is this pure, holy victim crushed for our sins and the sins of the world so that we might benefit from the Bread of life and of the Chalice of salvation. This would not have been possible had it not been for two important facts namely, that Jesus was that pure, holy (unblemished lamb – see Exodus 12: 1-13 – and the Lamb of God that John the Baptist proclaimed – see Jn. 1: 36) victim offered once and for all (see Matt. 26: 28 and Ephesians 1: 7) for the forgiveness of sins, and that he had not given of himself under the form of bread at the Last Supper.

For the record, during his ministry, Jesus had compared himself to a grain of wheat that falls and dies (see Jn. 12: 24); and also that he was the bread of life (see Jn. 6: 48-51). In the context of one of the predictions of his own death, Jesus explained that ‘unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit’ (Jn. 12: 24) which, when referring to himself, hypothetically, were he not to have died, he might have returned to God and our salvation might not have been effected. However, in fact, he did die and, consequently, his death bore much fruit namely, eternal redemption (see Heb. 9: 11,12). In addition, he proclaimed that he was the bread of life (see Jn. 6: 48) in the context of being the true, living bread from heaven in contrast to the manna that the ancestors of the Jews ate in the desert on their way to the Promised Land. This Christ made present at the Last Supper where he took bread and blessed it and broke it and gave it to his disciples saying, ‘Take, this is my body’ (Mk. 14: 22). In John, chapter six, the bread of life is given for the food of men so that Jesus, by dying, became the food for men’s souls so that man may have life. Thus transformed in Christ, we might become Christ in our community. This transformation in Christ hinges on *lex orandi... lex credendi* for what we pray is what we believe and when what we pray is distorted, that which we believe might then become a concern. As was noted in Chapter 1, the prayers of the Roman Canon are not so much concerned with what we do but what is done to us through Christ.

What happens at Mass and what is implied by an accurate and authentic translation of the Roman Canon is at the heart of this thesis. In an understanding of *lex orandi ... lex credendi* where we pray what we believe and what we believe informs what we pray, the accuracy and veracity of the translation of the Roman Canon is important. In this thesis I have used some references and authors that have a Thomistic influence in the discussion of an understanding of God and of the relationship of God and man. This might be interpreted as a limitation of the thesis as

there is a wealth of information that could be brought to this discussion through, for example, the theology of Bonaventure on the Eucharist.¹ This, then, might be an option for further research on the Eucharistic theology inherent in the Roman Canon.

So, as posited in Chapter 1 of this thesis, when one accepts that *lex orandi* communicates what the Church believes *lex credendi*, then, what the Catholic Church has been praying over time in Latin in the Roman Canon is not the same as the English translation of the Roman Canon that was revised by decree of the Second Vatican Council and published by authority of Pope Paul VI. As Monsignor Harbert noted, one of the major deficiencies of the 1974 translation of the Roman Missal, including the Roman Canon, was that ‘it employed the active voice of the verb extensively’ which left the impression on the minds of worshippers that what we prayed is something that one did rather than emphasising what might happen to us.² An example of this is the number of times the priest says, “we offer” / “we honour” or the imperative form of the verb, for example, “accept” and “Bless and approve” in the translation of the Roman Canon of 1974 whereas the translation of the Roman Canon of 2010 uses the passive voice of the verb. Consequently, this had implications on what the faithful, as Catholics, believed when they prayed the Eucharistic Prayer of 1974. It implied that we are the ones performing the action of the verb whereas, Christ performs the action of the celebration; so, the focus was incorrectly placed on us rather than on Christ. The priest stands *in persona Christi* and the prayers and actions should not be construed as being performed by him.

Secondly, a further problem of the translation approved by Pope Paul VI noted by Bishop Elliott was that the translation in many instances was a paraphrase of the Latin text and that ‘a paraphrase can fail to give us, not only what the Latin original means, which is bordering on telling lies, but a paraphrase often eliminates poetic beauty in the original, particularly scriptural language that runs through the prayers of the Roman Rite Mass’.³ The issue has been the accuracy of the translation of the Roman Canon approved by Pope Paul VI to which, subsequently, the Holy See promulgated the *Ratio Translationis* for the English Language stating ‘when faced with texts...translators should avoid vernacularisation which explains rather than

¹ Daniel P Horan, ‘Christocentricity, Unity and Ethics in Bonaventure’ Theology of the Eucharist’, *Worship* 85 (November 2011) pp. 503-520

² Bruce E Harbert, ‘The Roman Rite and the English Language’, *Antiphon* 9 Issue 1 (2005), p. 21

³ Bishop Peter Elliott, ‘Hear the difference: the new Missal translation will be like rediscovering buried treasure’, *Priest*, (2011), p. 4

translates’⁴ and that ‘in the process, the genre and the syntax of the original Latin needs to be respected in translations’.⁵

The comparative study, initially, included a discussion and analysis of the role of punctuation in the theological understanding of the content of the prayers of the First Eucharistic Prayer. It was demonstrated that the way that punctuation was employed had a bearing on the meaning conveyed in a prayer.

Secondly, the way that language and grammar were used had a significant influence on the theological interpretation of what we are praying. An example of this is in the 1974 translation where the faithful were praying for the Pope and the local ordinary ‘and for all who hold and teach the catholic faith that comes to us from the apostles’. The implication of this translation from Latin is that it is not clear that one is praying exclusively for the Catholic Church or another Christian community. The reason for this is in the syntax. By referring to the faith ‘that comes to us from the apostles’ implies that the Catholic faith originated from the apostles; but so, too, can other Christian denominations and communities claim the same. However, through the use of the adjective “apostolic”, in the phrase ‘hand on the catholic and apostolic faith’, which in Latin was rendered: ‘*et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicæ et apostolicæ fidei cultoribus*’, the 2010 translation of the Eucharistic Prayer has rectified the anomaly in the 1974 translation and made the apostolic origins of the Catholic faith clearer, which is implicit in the office of the Pope and in the bishops that are in communion with him.

As noted in that chapter, this was not a matter of semantics; there was an important truth behind the use of the adjective “apostolic”. By using the adjective in reference to the Catholic faith, the faithful, in the Eucharistic Prayer are making a claim that the Faith that we profess and that has been passed down to us is the Faith that was given the apostles by Christ – it is not some version or interpretation of the Christian Faith. The force of the conjunction “and” coming after the prayers for the Pope and the Bishop is that at the heart of the prayer and the use of the term “and” is that there is communion between the hierarchy and the members of the Mystical Body of Christ.

⁴ Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *Ratio Translationis* for the English Language, §12 (hereafter RT)

⁵ RT see §§ 32, 54 and 55 where the use of the “extended subordination” in the Latin rite is discussed and §§102, 103 and 104 syntax is used to convey theological statements

Furthermore, it was argued that the words and phrases chosen in the 2010 translation were chosen to translate not only the idea behind the word expressed in the context of the Eucharistic Prayer, but also the subtle nuances of that word translated from Latin had to be incorporated in the translation. For example, in the 1974 translation, the text of the prayer was “he took the cup” where the current translation, following the Latin text ‘*accipiens et hanc præclarum calicem*’, states “he took this precious chalice”, which is closer and more inclusive of the intention of what the prayer is attempting to convey. As was discussed in that chapter, the use of the word “cup” in the 1974 translation was not only an inadequate translation of the word “*calicem*” it also conveyed, by nuance, something that was not present in the term. So, if one were to be faithful to the idea of *lex orandi... lex credendi* then one had to choose wisely how one translated the prayers from Latin into English with reference to the *editio typica*, which is supported by *Ratio Translationis* that advised translators to avoid vernacularisation and to respect the syntax and genre of the original Latin.

Thirdly, the thesis has demonstrated how the translation of the First Eucharistic Prayer may influence one’s understanding of the relationship of mankind and God. As noted in Chapter 1, underpinning accurate and authentic translation is the understanding that translations should convey the meaning of the liturgical language. To this end, it was pointed out that where the whole Church prays with one voice, the voice of Christ, the language of the liturgy of necessity should be different from everyday language. Liturgical language is elevated language and incorporates the voices of the Church both in heaven and on earth. Hence, ‘familiarity with the sources of prayers from the *Missale Romanum* is of fundamental importance in accurate translation, since the meaning of such source texts in their original contexts is often blended into the final form of a collect, Preface, antiphon, canticle or blessing’.⁶ This point was developed in Chapter 3 where it was argued that an accurate translation of the prayers, in particular selected Prefaces, the idea of *lex orandi...lex credendi* could be more forcefully conveyed.

A selection of representative Prefaces were critiqued in terms of how they, as a whole, summarized the history of salvation and God’s role in that history. The proper “*Communicantes*” and “*Hanc Igitur*” prayers appropriate for significant feasts such as Christmas, the Epiphany, Holy Thursday and Easter were discussed and

⁶ RT §8

analysed in relation to their Prefaces. The purpose of this was to attain a clearer understanding of God and, through a comparative study of the two translations of the Prefaces with their associated prayers within the Eucharistic Prayer, a more acute perception of God was obtained through the 2010 translation – *lex orandi* that is, what we pray communicates what the Church believes *lex credendi*.

Aspects of an understanding of God differed in the two translations. As noted in Chapter 3, when the texts of the prayer appropriate to the feast were examined, the differences in the ideas expressed also became apparent. In the 1974 translation, the prayer speaks of the “wonder” of the Incarnation. The use of the term “wonder” suggested amazement and astonishment at something remarkable – in this case, the Incarnation. However, in this instance, as noted in the chapter, the mystery of the Incarnation is underscored through the use of the noun “wonder” because one uses this word generally to convey profound admiration at anything that may occur naturally or even at something that is miraculous – and it is phrased in such a way that it is construed as something admirable. In the reality of the Incarnation, though, there is something more profound and miraculous: God became man – ‘the Word became flesh and dwelt among us’ (Jn. 1: 14). In the 2010 translation the consequence of God’s action of the Incarnation is what happens to us – ‘we (are) caught up’ through Jesus ‘in love of things invisible’. The dynamics of the prayer is reversed from that of the translation of 1974. Whereas the subject of the action in the 1974 translation is the assembly at Mass (‘we do well’), in the 2010 translation, God is the subject of the action (‘For in the mystery of the Word made flesh’) and we are caught up in the consequence of that action. God, in the course of divine revelation concerning the salvation of mankind, far exceeded all that man had hoped for because He sent His own ‘beloved Son’ (see Mk. 1: 1 and Lk. 1: 55, 68). So, the 2010 translation of the Prefaces convey a more profound understanding of God, which was made possible through adherence to the directives of *Ratio Translationis*, which directed that ‘translators should avoid vernacularisation which explains rather than translates’.⁷

In Chapter 4 the focus was on the relationship of God and man, and of the role of grace as well as on the theology of merit as conveyed through the translation of the Roman Canon. The focus in this chapter was on God, God’s grace and the place that

⁷ RT, §12

merit played in man's salvation, as defined in the translations of the Roman Canon.

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* summarizes this well when it states:

The Paschal mystery has two aspects: by his death, Christ liberates us from sin; by his Resurrection, he opens for us the way to a new life. This new life is above all justification that reinstates us in God's grace, "so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life." Justification consists in both victory over the death caused by sin and a new participation in grace. It brings about filial adoption so that men become Christ's brethren, as Jesus himself called his disciples after his Resurrection: "Go and tell my brethren." We are brethren not by nature, but by the gift of grace, because that adoptive filiation gains us a real share in the life of the only Son, which was fully revealed in his Resurrection.⁸

In this chapter "grace" was discussed in terms of man's sanctification – a gift from God⁹, which is 'a participation in the life of God'.¹⁰ This continues to be a free gift from God; we did not merit it, and yet we have been justified by the grace of God won for us on Calvary. We have not merited this grace; we have been saved by the 'gratuitous favour of God' (see Eph. 2:8). Therefore, 'with regard to God, there is no strict right to any merit on the part of man. Between God and us there is an immeasurable inequality, for we have received everything from him, our Creator'.¹¹ Left to our own devices when we do not have a share in the divine life of God, we tend to stray from the divine will. However, in the mystery of salvation, God has come to meet us and a share in his grace, then, is his friendship with man.

As was noted in Chapter 4, *Lumen Gentium*, speaking of the Church as those 'who believe in Christ, who are reborn, not from a corruptible seed, but from an incorruptible one through the word of the living God (cf. 1 Pet. 1:23), not from flesh, but from water and the Holy Spirit (cf. Jn. 3:5-6), are finally established as a "chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people... once you were no people, but now are God's people" (1 Pet. 2:9-10)'.¹² The true Christian is a person who recognizes that he is a pilgrim on a journey to the Kingdom. And the great prayer of Thanksgiving in particular, and the Mass in general, are examples of the way that we respond to God's initiative not only of his self-revelation but also of his self-

⁸ CCC 654

⁹ CCC 1996

¹⁰ CCC 1997

¹¹ CCC 2007

¹² Second Vatican Council. Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium*, (21 November 1964) §9 (Hereafter LG)

immolation. Consequently, we have a duty to follow his command ‘love one another as I have loved you’ (Jn. 15: 12) and to participate in the greatest act of that love, God’s self-giving to us; including his Passion, Death and Resurrection, which are recalled and memorialised in the Eucharistic Prayer.

Mindful of its responsibilities to celebrate with dignity and respect the sacred mysteries that Christ left the Church in the liturgy of the Eucharist, the Magisterium, as noted in Chapter 4, took great care to articulate in the words of the Roman Canon what is being celebrated and how this is to be carried out. ‘According to the formula *lex orandi, lex credendi*, the Church’s liturgical rite will always be a reflection of her faith’.¹³ Therefore, when it is restricted to a current view and interpretation of who God is by some at a particular point in history, then the Eucharistic Prayer, for one, will lose its universal nature and aspect as a Prayer of Thanksgiving for and by the whole Church. Indeed, as was noted in Chapter 4, it was argued by Pope John Paul II that we needed to approach liturgy with a sacred fear similar to the fear that gripped Moses before the burning bush. The sight of the burning bush not being consumed by fire drew him into a new experience of God, so too, does God draw one into a unique and new experience of Himself through the Eucharistic celebration.

Like Moses before the burning bush, we are invited to this Eucharistic wonder of which Pope John Paul II spoke and which is made up of infinite respect. If God is present in the Eucharist, then we should first of all be filled with a feeling of fear: only God can take the initiative and bring himself near, right to the point of inviting us to enter into his intimacy.¹⁴

Therefore, in order for the faithful to obtain the graces that flow through the Eucharistic celebration, all, including the Magisterium in providing the faithful with a sacred and meaningful experience of liturgy and for them to access these graces, it is incumbent on the priest to prepare himself for the sacred mysteries over which he is privileged to preside; and the faithful have a responsibility to place themselves in the proper disposition to receive these graces. Priests have a responsibility to honour the language, syntax and punctuation of the current translation so that the theological implications of that translation have the opportunity an opportunity of being conveyed to the faithful. The faithful should resist the temptation in deferring to the priest the recitation of the Eucharistic Prayer but rather, in their minds and hearts take note of

¹³ Marc Aillet, *The Old Mass and the New* Explaining the Motu Proprio ‘*Summorum Pontificum*’ p. 40

¹⁴ Ibid. pp. 70-71

and become absorbed into the prayer that Christ is praying through the priest. As the prayer is recited in English, the faithful have a greater chance of becoming immersed in that prayer because they do not have to be distracted from reading in English what the priest had formally recited in Latin.

The translation of the Roman Canon approved by Pope Benedict XVI then, is not only closer in the sentiments of what is prayed in the Roman Canon in Latin but this Eucharistic Prayer also conveys more appropriately the relationship that exists between God and man – restoring their Creator/creature status that was lacking in the 1974 translation. The familiarity in the bond of the faithful with God had become distorted in the 1974 translation of the Roman Canon through its resort to vernacularisation and, as noted by Monsignor Harbert earlier in this chapter, that this might have left an impression on the minds of worshippers that what one prayed is something that one did rather than emphasising what might happen to one. The anomaly of this distortion has been rectified through the translation of the Roman Canon approved by Pope Benedict XVI and it has brought the prayers offered and the relationship between God and man into a more traditional one, underpinning the universality of the implications of *lex orandi... lex credendi* – underpinning the popular adage “As we pray, so do we believe” – in the prayers offered in the Roman Canon.

Bibliography

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE ROMAN MISSAL REVISED BY DECREE OF THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL AND PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF POPE PAUL VI (Protocol Number 166/70) – with both Latin and English texts – Published by E J Dwyer, Sydney, 1974.

MISSALE ROMANUM EX DECRETO SACROSANCTI ŒCUMENICI CONCILII VATICANI II INSTAURATUM AUCTORITATE PAULI PP. VI PROMULGATUM IOANNIS PAULI PP. II CURA RECOGNITUM (EDITIO TYPICA TERTIA), (Protocol Number 143/00/L) – Latin text – Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano, 2002.

THE ROMAN MISSAL RENEWED BY DECREE OF THE MOST HOLY SECOND ECUMENICAL COUNCIL OF THE VATICAN, PROMULGATED BY AUTHORITY OF POPE PAUL VI AND REVISED AT THE DIRECTION OF POPE JOHN PAUL II, English translation according to the Third Typical Edition (Protocol Number 143/00/L), Approved for use in the Dioceses of Australia, England and Wales, and Scotland by the Bishops' Conferences of Australia, England and Wales, and Scotland and confirmed by the Apostolic See, Published by Catholic Truth Society, UK, 2010.

In relation to a comparison with previous texts of the Roman Canon (in order to authenticate the relative stability of the Latin text in comparison with the widely different English texts of 1974 and 2010 of the Roman Canon) the Roman Canons from the following Roman Missals were used:

MISSALE ROMANUM ex decreto sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, S. Pii V Pontificis Maximi jussu editum, aliorum Pontificum cura recognitum, a Pio X reformatum, et Benedicti XV auctoritate bulgatum. Romae/Tornaci/Parisiis – Tupis Societatis S. Joannis Ebang., Desclee et Socii, S. Sedis Apost. Et S. Rituum Congreg. Typograph., 26 Januarii anno 1952.

MISSALE ROMANUM ex Decreto SS. Concilii Tridentini Restitutum Summorum Pontificum Cura Recognitum, Editio Typica, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, Decretum from Sacrae Rituum Congregationis, die 23 iunii 1962.

ALTAR MISSAL MISSALE ROMAN ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini Restitutum Summorum Pontificum Cura Recognitum cum Versionibus LinguaAnglica Exaratis et a Caetu Episcoporum Australiae Rite Approbatis, Benzinger Brothers, Sanctae Sedis et Sacrae Rituum Congregationis Typographorum, Novi Eboraci, 27 November 1964.

THE ROMAN MISSAL Revised by Decree of the Second Vatican Council and Published by Authority of Pope Paul VI, Protocol N° 166/70, Official English Texts Approved for use in Australia by the Australian Episcopal Conference, E. J. Dwyer, Sydney, 1974.

ROMAN MISSAL, The Revised by decree of the Second Vatican Council and published by authority of Pope Paul VI, Official English Texts (Sydney: E. J. Dwyer Pty. Ltd., 1975).

ROMAN MISSAL, The Study Edition, Renewed by decree of the Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican, promulgated by authority of Pope Paul VI and revised at the direction of Pope John Paul II, English translation according to the Third Typical Edition (London: Catholic Truth Society, 2010).

The Documents of Vatican II With Notes and Index, Vatican Translation (Sydney: St Pauls, 2009).

Australian Catholic Bishops Conference, *Ordo*, Tom Elich (compiler) (Brisbane: The Liturgical Commission, 2009-2014).

Aillet, Marc, *The Old Mass and the New, Explaining the Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum* of Pope Benedict XVI, Henry Taylor (trans.) (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010).

Angenendt, Arnold, 'Questionable praise of the old liturgy', *Worship*, 85, № 3 (2011), pp. 194-210.

Aquinas, Thomas, *Summa Theologica* 2nd and Revised Edition (London: Blackfriars, 1920) (Online Edition copyright by Kevin Knight, New Advent, 2009) <newadvent.org> (accessed 19/05/2014).

Beall, Stephen, 'Mirabili Dei: Style and translation in the Prefaces of the *Missale Romanum*' *Antiphon* Vol. 8, Issue 1, (2003), 10-21.

Become One Body One Spirit in Christ. (2010) [DVD]. Melbourne: International Committee on English in the Liturgy.

Benedict XVI, Pope, Encyclical Letter, *Deus Caritas Est*: On Christian Love (Sydney: St Pauls Publications, 2006).

——— Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, *Sacramentum Caritatis*. English translation: The Sacrament of Charity (22 February 2007) <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/apost_exhortations/documents/> (viewed 8 Jan. 2013).

——— Encyclical Letter, *Caritatis in Veritate*: Integral Human Development in Charity and Truth (Sydney: St Pauls Publications, 2009).

——— *I Believe in One God* (United Kingdom: St Pauls Publishing, 2012).

Biblia Sacra Iuxta Valgatum Versionem, ed. Robert Weber et al. 4th Emended Edition prepared by Roger Gryson et al. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969 & 1994).

Bohler, Dieter, 'Some Remarks from an Exegete on the Instruction *Liturgiam Authenticam*', *Antiphon*, Vol. 8, Issue 2, (2003), pp. 2-11.

Brown, Lesley (ed.), *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, On Historical Principles, Vols I & II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)

- Brown, Raymond E., Fitzmyer, Joseph A., & Murphy, Roland E. (Eds), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992)
- Buffer, Thomas, 'Salus in the Roman Missal: What it means and Why', *Antiphon*, Vol. 14: Issue 1, (2010), 30-44.
- Bugnini, Annibale, *The Reform of the Liturgy, 1948-1975*, Matthew O'Connell (trans.) (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990).
- Burke, Cardinal Raymond Leo, 'The Theo-centric Character of Catholic Liturgy', *The Thomist*, Vol. 75, (2011), pp. 347-64.
- Butler, Christopher, *The Theology of Vatican II* Revised and Enlarged Edition (Westminster, Maryland: Christian Classics Inc., 1981).
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2nd Ed. (Sydney: St Pauls Publication, 2009).
- Chauvet, Louis Marie, 'Are the words of the liturgy worn out? What diagnosis? What pastoral approach?', *Worship*, 84, № 1 (2010), pp. 25-37.
- Compendium of the Catechism of the Catholic Church*, World Youth Day Edition (Sydney: St Pauls Publication, 2008).
- Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, Fifth Instruction *Liturgiam Authenticam*. On Vernacular Translation of the Roman Liturgy – Latin-English Edition – (Vatican City: 28 March 2001)
- _____ *Ratio Translationis* For the English Language (Vatican City: 2007)
- _____ *The General Instruction of the Roman Missal*,
<http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_20030317_ordinamento-messale_en.html> (viewed 15 July 2014)
- _____ *General Norms for the Liturgical Year and Calendar*,
<<http://www.liturgyoffice.org.uk/Resources/GIRM/Documents/GNLY.pdf>> (Viewed 10 February 2013)
- Conrad, Sven, 'Renewal of the Liturgy in the Spirit of Tradition: Perspectives with a view towards the Liturgical Development of the West', *Antiphon*, 14: 1, (2010), 95-136.
- Consilium for Implementing the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, COMME LE PREVOIT—On The Translation Of Liturgical Texts For Celebrations With A Congregation, < <https://www.ewtn.com/library/CURIA/CONSLEPR.HTM>> (January 25, 1969) (Viewed Jan 2014)
- Corbon, Jean, *The Wellspring of Worship* 2nd Edition, Matthew J O'Connell (trans.) (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005).

- Crouan, Denis, *The Liturgy After Vatican II* Collapsing or Resurgent, Mark Sebanc (trans.) (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2001).
- Custer, Jack, 'The Eucharist as Thanksgiving Sacrifice', *Antiphon*, Vol. 12: Issue 1, (2008), 46-65.
- Deferrari, Roy J., *A Latin-English Dictionary of St. Thomas Aquinas based on The Summa Theologica* (Boston, MA: St. Pauls, 1986).
- Dizdar, Draško, *Sheer Grace* Living the Mystery of God (Sydney: St Pauls, 2008).
- Douglas, J.D. (ed.), *The New Greek-English Interlinear New Testament* 4th Edition (Illinois: Tyndale Publishing House, 1993).
- Doogue, Geraldine, 'Catholics Divided', *Compass*, (Sydney: Enhance Screenrights, 2012) date of broadcast: 01/04/2012.
- Eastwood, John, *Oxford Guide to English Grammar* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994)
- Elliott, Peter J., 'Liturgical Translation: A Question of Truth', *Antiphon*, Vol. 10: Issue 3, (2006), 228-238.
- 'Hear the difference: the new Missal translation will be like rediscovering buried treasure', *The Priest*, 26:1, May, (2011), 4-7.
- Emminghaus, Johannes, H., *The Eucharist* Essence, Form, Celebration, Matthew J. O'Connell (trans.) (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1978).
- Faggioli, Massimo, *True Reform*, Liturgy and Ecclesiology in "*Sacrosanctum Concilium*" (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2012).
- Foley, Michael P., '*Rituale Romanum*: Fulfilling the Jots and Tittles', *Antiphon*, Vol. 15: Issue 1, (2011), 78-91.
- Folsom, Cassian O.S.B., 'The Hermeneutics of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: Development of a Method and its Application', *Antiphon*, 8: 1, (2003), 2-9.
- Furness, Derick, 'The new translation', *The Swag*, autumn edition, (2013), pg. 26.
- Gleeson, Robert W., *Grace* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1962).
- Glenn, Paul J., *A Tour of the Summa* Fifth Printing (Rockford, Illinois: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc. 1978).
- Glison, Etienne, *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* with a Catalogue of St. Thomas's Works by I. T. Eschmann, O.P., Translated by L. K. Shook, C.S.B. (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, Reprinted 2006).

- Grace, Madeleine, 'Looking Again at Looking Eastward: *Ad orientem* Worship and Liturgical Renewal', *Antiphon*, Vol. 14: Issue 3, (2010), 285-300.
- Guardini, Romano, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, Ada Lane (trans.) (New York: Herder & Herder, 1998).
- Guéranger, Dom Prosper, *The Holy Mass* 2nd Impression (London: Baronius Press, 2008).
- Harbert, Bruce E., 'The Roman Rite and the English Language', *Antiphon*, Vol. 9: Issue 1, (2005), 16-29.
- Hastings, Adrian, *A Concise Guide to the Documents of the Second Vatican Council* vol. 1 (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1968).
- Hertz, J. H., *The Pentateuch and Haftorahs* Hebrew Text, English Translation and Commentary, Second Edition (London: Soncino Press, 1979).
- Hilgartner, Rick, *Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi*: The Word of God in the Celebration of the Sacraments, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Catechetical Sunday, September 20, 2009. Washington DC: USCCB, 2009. < <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/how-we-teach/catechesis/catechetical-sunday/word-of-god/upload/lex-orandi-lex-credendi.pdf> > (viewed Jan. 2014)
- Horan, Daniel P., 'Christocentricity, Unity and Ethics in Bonaventure's Theology of the Eucharist', *Worship* 85, (November 2011) 503-520.
- Hull Hitchcock, Helen, 'Pope Benedict XVI and the "Reform of the Reform"', *Antiphon*, Vol. 12: Issue 2, (2008), 179-197.
- Irwin, Kevin W., 'Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi – Origins and Meanings: State of the Question', *Liturgical Ministry* 11 (Spring 2002), 57-69.
- John Paul II, Pope, Encyclical Letter, "*Ecclesia de Eucharistia*". English translation: On the Eucharist in its Relationship to the Church (17 April 2003)
<http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/special_features/encyclicals/documents/> (viewed 15 Jan. 2013).
- Journet, Charles, *The Meaning of Grace*, A.V. Littledale (trans.) (Princeton, New Jersey: Scepter Publishers, 1996).
- Jungmann, Josef A., *Public Worship* A Survey (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1957).
- *The Mass* An Historical, Theological and Pastoral Survey (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1976).
- Kidd, D A, *Latin Dictionary* plus Grammar (Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers Limited, 2003).

- Kocik, Thomas M., 'The "Reform of the Reform" in Broad Context: Re-engaging the Living Tradition', *Antiphon*, Vol. 12: Issue 1, (2008), 26-44.
- Kreeft, Peter (ed.), *Summa of the Summa* The Essential Philosophical Passages of St. Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologica* Edited and Explained for Beginners (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990).
- LabOra Worship*, (2009 - 2014) [DVD]. Brisbane: The Liturgical Commission.
- Lemna, Keith, 'Louis Bouyer's Defense of Religion and the Sacred: Sacrifice and the Primacy of Divine Gift in Christian Liturgy', *Antiphon*, Vol. 12: Issue 1, (2008), 2-24.
- Leon-Dufour (ed.), *Dictionary of Biblical Theology* 2nd Edition (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1978).
- Lewis, Charlton T & Short, Charles, *A Latin Dictionary*, Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary Revised, Enlarged, and in Great Part Rewritten (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951).
- Lewis, Charlton T & Short, Charles, *A new Latin Dictionary*
<https://archive.org/stream/LewisAndShortANewLatinDictionary/lewisandshort#page/n1758/mode/1up> (viewed 1 November 2014).
- Littlejohn, Joyce (Editorial coordinator), *Latin Dictionary plus Grammar* (Glasgow UK: Harper Collins Publishers, 2003).
- Liturgy Documents*, The vol. 1, 4th Edition (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2004).
- MacLeod, Paul, 'The elephant in the sanctuary', *AD 2000* Vol. 26, № 5 (June 2013), pg. 15.
- Magee, Michael K., 'Receiving the Tradition: Three Windows into the Thought of Pope Benedict XVI on the Liturgy', *Antiphon*, Vol. 12: Issue 2, (2008), 107-125.
- Marshall, Alfred, *The RSV Interlinear Greek-English New Testament* 3rd Impression (London: Samuel Bagster, 1979).
- Mankowski SJ, Paul, 'The Necessary Failure of Inclusive-language Translations: A Linguistic Elucidation', *The Thomist*, Vol. 62, (1998), pp. 445-68.
- Mazza, Enrico, *Mystagogy A Theology of Liturgy in the Patristic Age* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company 1989).
- *The Origins of the Eucharist Prayer* Ronald E. Lane (trans.) (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1995).
- *The Celebration of the Eucharist The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1999).
- McKenzie, John, L., *Dictionary of the Bible* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1985).

- Mejía, Cardinal Jorge, 'The Problem of Translation: Some Linguistic and Other Considerations', *Antiphon*, Vol. 12: Issue 2, (2008), 98-104.
- Metzger, Marcel, *History of the Liturgy The Major Stages*, Madeleine M Beaumont (trans.) (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1997).
- Nichols OP, Aidan, 'St. Thomas and the Sacramental Liturgy', *The Thomist*, Vol. 72, (2008), 571-93.
- Pesarchick, Robert A., 'Contrasting Perspectives on the Participation of the Laity in Priestly Ministry', *Antiphon*, Vol. 15: Issue 2, (2011), 128-150.
- Paul VI, Pope, Apostolic Constitution *Paenitemini*. English translation: On Fast and Abstinence (February 17, 1966) <http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_p-vi_apc_19660217_paenitemini.html> (viewed Jan 2014)
- Pius X, Pope, Motu Proprio *Tra le Sollecitudini*. English translation: Instruction on Sacred Music (22 November 1903) <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_x/motu_proprio/documents/> (viewed 22 June 2013).
- Pius XI, Pope, Apostolic Constitution *Divini Cultus*. English translation: On Divine Worship (20 December 1928) <<http://www.omm.org/documents/>> (viewed 22 June 2013).
- Pius XII, Pope, Encyclical Letter, "*Mediator Dei*". English translation: On the Sacred Liturgy (20 November 1947) <http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_20111947_mediator-dei.html> (viewed 22 June 2013).
- Pristas, Lauren, 'Missale Romanum 1962 and 1970: A Comparative Study of Two Collects', *Antiphon*, 7: 3 (2002), 29-33.
- 'Theological Principles that guided the Redaction of the Roman Missal, (1970)', *The Thomist*, Vol. 67, (2003), 157-95.
- 'The Post-Vatican II Revision of the Lenten Collects', in Uwe Michael Lang (ed.). *Ever Directed Towards the Lord: The Love of God in the Liturgy of the Eucharist Past, Present, and Hoped For* (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2007).
- Ranjith, Most Rev. Malcolm, 'Towards an *Ars Celebrandi* in the Liturgy', *Antiphon*, 13: 1, (2009), 7-17.
- Ratzinger, Joseph, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, John Saward (trans.) (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000).
- *Jesus of Nazareth from the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration*, Adrian J. Walker (trans.) (New York: Doubleday, 2007).

- *Jesus of Nazareth, Holy Week: from the Entrance into Jerusalem to the Resurrection* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2011).
- *Jesus of Nazareth, The Infancy Narratives*, Philip J. Whitmore (trans.) (London: Bloomsbury, 2012).
- Rigali, Cardinal Justin, *Reliving Vatican II It's All about Jesus Christ* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2006).
- Richard, Edward J and Van Slyke, Daniel G., 'Liturgy in the Spiritual Formation of Future Priests', *Antiphon*, Vol. 15: Issue 2 (2011), 172-184.
- Roy, Neil J., 'Christ the Eternal High Priest in Two Images by Maximilian Schmalzl, C.Ss.R', *Antiphon*, 14: 1, (2010), 17-29.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward, *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1963).
- Serra, Dominic E., 'The Roman Canon: The Theological Significance of Its Structure and Syntax', in Thomas J Fisch(ed.) *Primary Readings on the Eucharist* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2004)
- Simpson, D.P., *Cassell's New Latin-English English-Latin Dictionary* 3rd Edition (London: Cassell, 1964).
- Stelten, Leo F., *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin* 3rd Printing (Peabody, MA: 1997).
- Stravinskas, Peter M. J., 'Defending the New Roman Missal: A Response to Father Michael Ryan', *Antiphon*, Vol. 14: Issue 1, (2010), 142-146.
- Summers, Della (Ed. Dir.), *Longman Language Activator the World's First Production Dictionary*, 6th Impression (United Kingdom: Longman, 1996).
- Thomson, A.J. and A.V. Martinet, *A Practical English Grammar*, 4th Edition (London: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- Tribe, Shawn, "'The Genius of the Roman Liturgy" CIEL Colloquium 2006', *Antiphon*, 10: 3, (2006), 314-322.
- Turabian, Kate L., *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations* 8th Edition, Revised by Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, Joseph M. Williams, and the University of Chicago Press Editorial Staff (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013).
- Vawter, Bruce, "The Gospel According to John" in *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, Vol. II, edited by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, 414-466 (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1968).
- von Cochem, Martin, *The Incredible Catholic Mass An Explanation of the Mass*, (Charlotte, North Carolina: tan Books, 2012).

Wambacq, B., 'Sabaoth' *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* Second Edition. Vol. 12 Ref-Sep. (New York: Thomson Gale, 2003).

Willis SJ, John R. (ed.), *The Teachings of the Church Fathers* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2002).